THE

# RETROSPECT;

OR,

# A COLLECTION OF TRACTS,

PUBLISHED AT VARIOUS

*PERIODS OF THE WAR.*

[PRICE SIX SHILLINGS.]

# RETROSPECT;

## A COLLECTION OF TRACTS,

PUBLISHED AT VARIOUS

## PERIODS OF THE WAR.

[PRICE SIX SHILLINGS.]

THE

# RETROSPECT;

OR,

# A COLLECTION OF TRACTS,

PUBLISHED AT VARIOUS

## *PERIODS OF THE WAR.*

INCLUDING

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE INFLUENCE OF MR. LOCKE'S THEORIES ON GOVERNMENT, IN PRODUCING THAT COMBINATION OF ANARCHY AND OPPRESSION, WHICH HAS ASSUMED THE NAME OF JACOBINISM.

WITH

## A GENERAL PREFACE.

---

DEDICATED TO

HIS MOST CHRISTIAN MAJESTY, LOUIS XVIII.

KING OF FRANCE, NAVARRE, &c.

---

MONITI MELIORA SEQUAMUR.——VIRG.

---

*By JOHN BOWLES, Esq.*

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. N. LONGMAN, PATERNOSTER-ROW;

AND SOLD BY J. HATCHARD, 173, PICCADILLY;

AND BY L'HOMME, NEW BOND-STREET.

1798.

BRITISH MUSEUM

TO HIS

# MOST CHRISTIAN MAJESTY,

## *LOUIS XVIII.*

## KING OF FRANCE, NAVARRE, &c.

*SIRE,*

*THE circumſtances in which your Majeſty is placed, demand every poſsible expreſsion of reſpect and of ſympathy from the friends of Regular Government, and of Social Order, throughout the world. At all times, the ſituation of a Monarch, deprived of his lawful Rights, by the foul crime of Rebellion, muſt wound the feelings of every virtuous mind. But your Majeſty's injuries, and thoſe of your Royal Houſe, are intereſting beyond example, and beyond deſcription. Your wrongs are thoſe of every Sovereign---your misfortunes are thoſe of the whole Human Race.—The enemies of your Throne are the enemies of every Throne, and of every ſocial Inſtitution, Religious and Civil.---Never did there exiſt*

*Calamities, ſo great and ſo univerſal, as thoſe which have been produced by the dethronement of your auguſt and virtuous Brother.---Never was an event ſo deſirable---ſo eſſential to the happineſs of Man, as the reeſtabliſhment of the Gallic Monarchy. By that event not only your own ſuffering people, but all the nations of Europe, and, indeed, of the world, would be delivered from an enemy, who has already covered a large portion of the Earth with ſlaughter and miſery, and who ſeeks to extend his Empire of Deſolation and Anarchy, wherever a human habitation is to be found; and Religion, Juſtice, and Order, would regain their ſway among the Sons of Men.*

*To accelerate an event, ſo devoutly to be wiſhed by every friend to Humanity, was a principal object of the following work, which, therefore, I hope, may, without impropriety, though without your permiſsion or privity, be laid at your Majeſty's feet, in teſtimony of my profound reſpect for your Perſon, Character, and legitimate Rights. Nor does its*

*claim*

*claim terminate there. Through your Majeſty, it is virtually inſcribed to all the lawful Sovereigns in Europe, whoſe cauſe is united to yours by an indiſſoluble tie; and, above all, to my own moſt gracious and revered Sovereign, the ſecurity of whoſe Crown and Perſon is the chief object of my ſolicitude, during this tremendous Hurricane, which ſhakes the whole Fabrick of Civil Society, to its deepeſt foundations.*

*That the Rights of the Crown of France may be ſpeedily and firmly re-eſtabliſhed in the Perſon of your*

MAJESTY,

*Is the fervent prayer of,*

*Sire,*

*Your moſt obedient*

*and humble ſervant.*

*JOHN BOWLES.*

LONDON, DEC. 1, 1798.

9 DE 63

# PREFACE.

WHEN a Malady has long baffled every effort of medical ſkill, and, inſtead of ſeeming to yield to the force of medicine, continues to exhibit freſh appearances of a moſt alarming nature, a wiſe and prudent Phyſician will pauſe and reflect upon the mode of treatment which has been purſued. He will review, with minute attention, the whole courſe of the diſorder, from its firſt eruption.—He will recal to his recollection the various ſymptoms it has ſucceſſively exhibited. —He will endeavour to aſcertain the real effects of each remedy which has been tried—And, diveſting himſelf of all prejudice, he will examine the different opinions which have been given upon the caſe, and conſider whether the advice which has been rejected was not beſt calculated to promote a cure.

It will not be diſputed that theſe obſervations are as applicable to State Phyſicians, as to thoſe of the body—to the Maladies of Nations, as to thoſe of individuals; and, it is but too evident, that the circumſtances of the moment call loudly for their application. A moſt dreadful Malady, epidemical and virulent in the higheſt degree, has broken forth, and threatens the whole frame of Civil Society with diſſolution. Many Nations, but a little while ſince in high vigour, have already fallen victims to this ſocial plague. Of thoſe which ſurvive, ſome appear to be at the laſt agony, and all are in the moſt imminent danger. Great Britain, thanks to the excellence of her Conſtitution, and to her many natural and acquired advantages, has alone ſtruggled vigorouſly with the diſorder. But even ſhe contains within herſelf the ſeeds of deep infection, and, unleſs the wide ſpreading peſtilence be got under, no ſtrength of Conſtitution can be expected ultimately to prevail over it.

It is not to be denied that great and extraordinary efforts have been made to check the progreſs

greſs of this Malady. The moſt powerful States of Europe have been united in a great, and, as was thought, an invincible Confederacy, to avert the ruin with which all States were menaced.—The moſt experienced Generals have led on the moſt diſciplined and the beſt appointed armies.—The moſt copious ſupplies have been raiſed and expended—numberleſs battles have been fought with the moſt deſperate fury.—The ſtrongeſt cities have been vigorouſly beſieged and bravely defended.—But all the while the evil has been rapidly gaining ground, until it has acquired its preſent tremendous magnitude, while the means of reſiſtance have been in proportion enfeebled and diminiſhed.

It requires but a very ſmall degree of penetration to diſcover, that the failure of ſuch efforts is owing to their not having been properly directed, and that a much inferior degree of exertion, if judiciouſly and ſeaſonably applied, would probably have vanquiſhed the diſeaſe which now rages with unceaſing fury. The caſe has certainly been miſtaken. The violent ſymptoms

toms have been conſidered as the diſorder itſelf, and the deep-rooted cauſe has been overlooked. The War has been treated as the Malady, while the principles and deſigns which produced it, and which are infinitely more miſchievous than the moſt ruinous War, have ſcarcely excited any alarm. Nothing elſe has been deemed neceſſary than to reſiſt the open attacks of the enemy, and to guard againſt the ordinary dangers with which all Wars, more or leſs, are fraught; but no pains have been taken to counteract the contagious ſyſtem which conſtituted the real danger. Nor has the War itſelf been conducted as it ought to have been, conſidering that, inſtead of being produced, like other Wars, by ambition or reſentment, it ſprang from the diſorganizing ſpirit of Anarchy; and that inſtead of aiming merely at conqueſt and aggrandizement, its object, on the part of the enemy, was no leſs than the intire ſubverſion of all ſocial order.

THIS miſtake, in the conduct of the War, has beenfundamntal Beg un, in every inſtance, by the aggreſſion of France, the War has been juſtly conſidered *a War of Defence*. And ſo it would have

have been, ſtrictly ſpeaking, if it had been actually commenced by the Combined Powers, for they had all received provocations, not only abundantly more than ſufficient to juſtify their reſorting to hoſtiliries *, but ſuch as their honour, their

* This truth is ſo obvious, that even the warmeſt advocates for France, and the moſt ſtrenuous oppoſers of the Britiſh Government, cannot refuſe it their ſanction, when they venture (as they ſometimes imprudently do) to meddle with a queſtion ſo unfavourable to their cauſe. Mr. Erſkine, one of the warmeſt of thoſe advocates, and one of the moſt ſtrenuous of thoſe oppoſers, in his pamphlet, intitled, "A View of the Cauſes and Conſequences of the "War," has acknowledged that the conduct of France was injurious and aggreſſive in the higheſt poſſible degree. "I "deſire," ſays he, "very diſtinctly to be underſtood, that I "am not undertaking the juſtification of the conduct of "France at this period" (before the War), "though I ſhall "ever think her more ſinned againſt than ſinning. With "regard to this decree of the 19th of November, NO CON-"SIDERATION CAN JUSTIFY IT; becauſe there is a great "difference between one nation giving particular aſſiſtance "to another which is oppreſſed by its government, as King "William did to England, and *a general proſpective Declara-"tion*, ſuch as *is contained in the Decree of the 19th of Novem-"ber*, and which *became hoſtile to the peace of other nations*, as "being iſſued upon the eve of a great revolution, which "naturally

their eſſential intereſts, and even their ſafety, called upon them to reſent in that manner. But, as a War of Defence, it ſhould have been conducted in a manner calculated to make it really *defenſive*, and to enſure the true object of Defence, Security. For this purpoſe the Combined Powers ſhould have conſidered that they were engaged with an enemy who was determined on their

" naturally affected the temper and feelings of mankind. " Neither do I ſeek to maintain that England ſhould have " reſted ſecure from the explanation of *the other points in dif-* " *ference*, much leſs that ſhe ſhould *have relied upon the ſin-* " *cerity of them*, or the durability of French councils, to give " ſincerity its effect. Theſe are matters of fair political " controverſy which I purpoſely avoid; but hazard the aſſer- " tion, that common policy and common ſenſe abſolutely " enjoined that they ſhould either have been made THE IN- " STANT FOUNDATIONS OF WAR, AS AGGRESSIONS WHICH " ADMITTED NO SETTLEMENT, or the ſubject of negocia- " tions upon terms conſiſtent with dignity and ſafety." In another publication, which is diſtinguiſhed for its attachment to the cauſe of France, and for its rancour againſt every Sovereign who has reſiſted the progreſs of French arms and French principles, it is admitted not merely that France gave abundant provocation for the War with the Emperor of Germany, but that ſhe actually begun and even precipitated that War for the deteſtable purpoſe of reviving the differences,

their deſtruction—an enemy whoſe principles were ſtill more formidable than his arms, who laboured inceſſantly to excite inſurrection in every State, and who had actually and openly promiſed his aſſiſtance to every people, who would rebel againſt their lawful Sovereign—an enemy whoſe obvious deſign it was to dethrone and murder all Kings, to ſubvert every Government and every ſocial inſtitution, religious and civil, and to revolutionize every country—an enemy, in ſhort, whoſe

differences, which had been healed, between the Emperor and his ſubjects, and of re-kindling the flames of civil War which had been extinguiſhed. "Among the moſt powerful motives which impelled the politicians of France to *haſten the commencement of hoſtilities*, we muſt certainly conſider the probable expectation they formed of a ready reception and powerful ſupport from the Belgic Provinces, which had ſo lately been in a ſtate of revolt, and were, at this period, ſcarcely reconciled to the dominion of the Houſe of Auſtria. The operations of the campaign were precipitated on this account; and their haſty and ill-concerted meaſures were attended with the ſucceſs that they might reaſonably have expected." *New Ann. Reg.* 1792. This ſtatement is undoubtedly true, and affords indiſputable proof of the moſt wicked aggreſſion on the part of France, in the war with the Emperor of Germany. What muſt be that cauſe in reſpect of which its admirers and its friends make ſuch conceſſions! *Ex tuo ore!*

exiſtence

exiſtence was incompatible with that of civilized ſociety. Againſt ſuch an enemy there was but one mode of defence, a mode preſcribed by the ſupreme law of ſelf-preſervation—namely, to make his deſtruction the ſole object of the War. The conteſt admitted but of one queſtion; whether the ancient States and Governments of Europe, or their new, bitter, and irreconcilable foe, ſhould be deſtroyed. There was no other alternative. Both could not exiſt. It, therefore, became not merely the right, but the bounden and indiſpenſable duty of the Confederated Powers (and, indeed, of all Powers) to aim their blows at the heart of this enemy. This was a duty which they owed, not only to themſelves, but to God, by whom they were entruſted with their authority, and to every individual whom he had placed under their protection. Nay, it is alike the duty and the intereſt of every individual to raiſe his hand againſt a foe, whoſe aim is nothing leſs than univerſal deſolation. Such a foe muſt be conſidered as a monſter having *caput lupinum*; and all perſons, who value either their own ſafety, or that of their families, ſhould endeavour to give him a mortal wound.

Nor is this doctrine liable to the charge, that it is fraught with ſeverity againſt the French people. It is, on the contrary, ſtill more friendly, if poſſible, to their intereſts than to thoſe of the reſt of Europe, for it tends to their deliverance from that accumulated and inexpreſſible miſery, which other Countries, not yet in the power of France, have only to apprehend. They are in the very jaws of the Hydra, which threatens every other people with deſtruction.

It is, however, but too obvious, that the War has not been conducted upon the principle which could alone render it, in the true ſenſe of the word, *a defenſive War*. The Allied Powers do not ſeem to have been at all aware, that they were contending with an enemy whoſe extermination was neceſſary for their preſervation. On the contrary, they appear to have thought that he might ſafely be admitted into the ſociety of civilized States—that he might be brought to reſpect the laws of Nations, which he had violated, and even abjured—that he might be prevailed on to renounce thoſe principles and practices, by which he evidenced a ſettled de-

ſign to overturn every Throne and every Altar, in order to erect upon their ruins his own unqualified deſpotiſm of Liberty and Fraternity—that he might, at leaſt, be perſuaded to connive at that Royalty, to which he annually ſwore irreconcileable hatred, and to tolerate the worſhip of that God, whoſe name he had abſured, and whoſe exiſtence he had denied—and that, in ſhort, it might become prudent to admit, in the midſt of Chriſtendom, the eſtabliſhment of a Power, which is founded in Infidelity, which has profeſſed Atheiſm, and which has ſhown itſelf the bittereſt perſecutor of the Chriſtian Church that ever yet appeared. Unleſs they were actuated by theſe ſentiments, it is impoſſible to account for their conduct. Experience, direful experience, muſt long e'er now have convinced them of their error. They muſt now be fully ſatisfied, that until the Ethiopian can change his ſkin, and the Leopard his ſpots; that until the Lamb may ſecurely lie down with the Lion, and the Sparrow aſſociate, in ſafe and friendly intercourſe with the Hawk, it will be impoſſible for them to enjoy repoſe,

or

or ſecurity, while the French Republic ſhall continue to exiſt.

To inculcate the neceſſity of a general and perſevering combination of the Powers of Europe, for the deſtruction of this anarchical and inexpreſſibly miſchievous Republic, was the main object of the following Tracts; which were publiſhed at different periods of the War, as circumſtances ſeemed to give occaſion for freſh obſervation. As their object is ſtill, at leaſt, as important as ever, it is conceived that they will not be found unſeaſonable at this moment, and that their being preſented, collectively, to the public eye, will not be deemed impertinent or aſſuming. If the advice they contain has been fully ſanctioned by experience—if it be now proved by events to be a great and a general misfortune, that ſuch advice was not followed—they may, perhaps, ſpeak more forcibly to the mind, than a work poſſeſſing the recommendation of novelty, though it were the production of a much abler pen. At all events the re-peruſal of them will aſſiſt in producing that Retroſpect, which, as before obſerved, it

is ſo material to take at the preſent criſis, when the fate of civil ſociety may depend upon an immediate diſcovery and correction of paſt errors, and upon the adoption of that line of conduct, which dear bought experience preſcribes.

A conſiderable part of the reaſoning contained in theſe tracts, was intended to prove that the ſecurity of all regular Government, and the continuance of the bleſſings of orderly ſociety, were, under the ſubſiſting circumſtances, eſſentially connected with the fate of the French Monarchy; and that it was therefore the indiſpenſable duty of the Powers of Europe, to declare for the Lawful Sovereign of France, and to make his reſtoration the immediate and the avowed object of the War, as the beſt, and, perhaps, the only means of attaining its ultimate object, the deſtruction of the common enemy of all Governments, and of all eſtabliſhments, religious and civil. Is there now a man in Europe, who is friendly to thoſe eſtabliſhments, who does not lament that this courſe was not followed? Is there one, who is not

not now convinced, that the cauſe of the French Monarch is that of every Monarch, nay of every individual, who is deſirous of the preſervation of order, and the protection of law? Is there one who does not now ſee, that a Declaration in favour of the Gallic King, would have been no leſs politic, than juſt and honourable—that it would have conduced more than any thing elſe, to the ſucceſs of the Allies, by pledging them to a common and ſpecific object, and by preventing that fatal diſtruſt and jealouſy, which a ſuſpicion, that each was purſuing his own private views, could not fail to excite—and that it would have deprived the French uſurpers of the only pretext they had to unite all parties in France, that of inſinuating that the Combined Powers had confederated for the diſmemberment and partition of the Country?

At one moment the two leading Powers on the Continent, ſeemed to have a momentary glimpſe of their intereſt in the fate of the Houſe of Bourbon. The Emperor and the King of Pruſſia, at a conference between thoſe

Monarchs at Pilnitz, in the year 1791, delivered to the Count d'Artois a Declaration, containing an acknowledgment that the ſituation of the King of France was "an object of common concern to "all the Sovereigns of Europe." How fully has this obſervation been verified! But, alas! how ſoon was it loſt ſight of. It was, indeed, but a very faint gleam which broke in upon the minds of theſe Princes. Elſe, how could their recognition of their *concern* in the ſituation of the King of France be followed by a Declaration, that they would be ready merely to co-operate with the other Powers of Europe, in placing that King "in a ſtate to ſettle, in the "moſt perfect liberty, the foundations of a Mo-"narchical Government." As if the foundations of ſuch a Government had not been long ſettled in France; and as if it were not an attack on thoſe foundations which had endangered the in-tire fabric of their own authority, and of all law-ful authority.

It was not merely the ſituation of the perſon of the King of France, but that of his Throne—that of his Monarchy—which was a matter of common concern to all Sovereigns. He was at-

tacked,

tacked, not by a Competitor for his Throne, nor by an ordinary Rebellion, but by a new and formidable ſyſtem, which was, in effect, an attack upon all Thrones, and upon all regular Government. They were not only intitled, but bound to interfere in his cauſe. It was not only their intereſt, but their duty to defend him againſt ſuch an attack, and by their joint efforts to reſtore him to a ſituation—not to *lay the foundations* of a Monarchy—but to maintain his ancient and legitimate authority.

For want of a timely conviction of theſe truths, the moſt powerful Confederacy that Europe ever ſaw, has been broken and diſſolved; and the Continental Powers, of which it was chiefly compoſed, have been induced, one after another, to withdraw themſelves from that union, in which, alone, any ſafety could be found from the univerſally deſtructive deſigns of France. Thoſe Powers have now taſted the ſweets of Republican Peace. Some of them have found death in the cup. Others continue to exiſt, only becauſe they have not drunk it to the dregs. One Monarch ſeems to be in a delirium, which renders him inſenſible

of his danger, and from which, thoſe who ſurround him take all poſſible care to prevent his being rouſed. But, unleſs he throw off the deadly potion, which locks up his faculties, he will wake but to expire. Nay, the experience of other States, which have never been engaged in the War, and which have even made it their grand ſtudy to conciliate the favour of the French rulers, proves, in a ſtill more forcible manner, that there can be no ſafety for any Government, of whatever denomination, if the new Republic ſhould be permitted to eſtabliſh itſelf. The exiſtence of that Republic is incompatible with the ſafety of every eſtabliſhed Government, of whatever denomination. This truth is awfully recorded over the aſhes of the departed Republics of Genoa, Venice, and Switzerland *; and the

* Switzerland; the fate of this unfortunate country, and the means by which its deſtruction has been accompliſhed, ſeem to have had more effect, than all the other atrocities of the French Republic, in opening the eyes of Europe, reſpecting the real deſigns of the rulers of that Republic. But that event is particularly inſtructive to the people of this country, between whoſe ſituation, and that of the unfortunate Swiſs, there was, in many reſpects, a ſtriking reſemblance.

the armed citizens of America, with Waſhington again at their head, proclaim aloud, to the whole world, that no kindneſs, no ſervices, no diſtance, can counteract the baneful effects of French Republican Amity.

But for the firm and reſolute ſtand made by Great Britain, it can ſcarcely be doubted that the whole Continent of Europe, would ere now, have been

blance. Both were in the enjoyment of a high degree of freedom and felicity—both exhibited a religious and moral character, beyond any other people in the world—both were remarkably attached to their Government—and both were curſed with a deſperate faction, which took part with the common enemy, oppoſed every endeavour to check his progreſs and defeat his deſigns, recommended conciliation, confidence, and even conceſſion; and, by exciting an unſeaſonable and puſillanimous inclination for Peace, laboured to quench every ſpark of that martial ſpirit, which alone, at ſuch a time, could afford the ſmalleſt degree of ſecurity. The difference now diſplayed by the two countries—a difference ſtill more ſtriking than their former reſemblance—is intirely owing to the different ſucceſs which has attended the machinations of theſe reſpective factions. In Great Britain, the energy of a Monarchical Government, and the firmneſs of a wiſe and vigorous adminiſtration, have defeated the arts

of

been ſwallowed up in that Revolutionary vortex, which has ingulphed ſo many of its States, or, at leaſt, that the Northern Powers would alone have remained, though with little chance of ſucceſs, to oppoſe any barrier to the overwhelming torrent.

An invaluable opportunity is thus afforded to the Continental Powers to recover their breath, to rally their forces, and to return to the charge. But not a moment is to be loſt. The leaſt de-

of a factious oppoſition, and the country not only maintains its independence, but appears more glorious and reſplendent than at any former period of its hiſtory. In Switzerland, a factious oppoſition, favoured, undoubtedly, by the diſadvantages attending Republican forms, has prevailed over the Government, and has, thereby, enabled a foreign foe to ſubject theſe late happy provinces to the moſt debaſing and galling yoke. To the *Swiſs Foxites*, leſs profligate than thoſe of Great Britain, France is indebted for a conqueſt which ſhe would never have achieved without their aſſiſtance. And if the *Foxites* in this country had been able to acquire as much influence as they did in Switzerland, Great Britain would, ere now, have been as miſerable and as degraded as the Swiſs Cantons. The picture of the Revolution in Switzerland, drawn by the maſterly pen of M. Mallet du Pan, particularly deſerves the attentive peruſal of Britons.

lay

lay may be fatal. Is it poſſible they can want any further proof of their danger? Can they require any additional evidence of the deſtructive deſigns of France? Is there a ſingle Sovereign who does not ſee that his ruin is determined on? Is there one who can poſſibly be the dupe of any profeſſions with which the crafty and perfidious Republic may ſeek to amuſe him. Let ſuch a Sovereign, if ſuch a one can exiſt, conſider the fate of thoſe Countries which have truſted to Republican faith; nay, let him look to his own Country, and ſee whether, while he is cajoled by magnificent promiſes, the revolutionary work is not going on among his ſubjects, through the agency of Directorial incendiaries, diſguiſed under the garb, or lurking in the train of Republican Embaſſadors. In ſhort, is there a Potentate in Europe, who would conſent to be left alone, after all his neighbours are laid low, to encounter the enmity, or to truſt to the friendſhip or honour of France?

To prevent a renewal of the Confederacy, which failed of ſucceſs only becauſe it was not ſenſible of its real danger, and which would

now

now have the benefit of experience, the inſidious Republic employs all her artifices. She endeavours to foment the ancient jealouſies of the continental States, to make them envious of the power, ſuſpicious of the deſigns, and ſolicitous for the humiliation of each other. She even cajoles them to acquieſce in her aggrandizement, becauſe it is acquired at the expence of a rival. But can they fail to perceive that their new danger infinitely exceeds any that they can apprehend from one another? That they have now, for the firſt time, a perfect identity of intereſt? That the preſervation of each depends upon the ſafety of all? That the politics of Europe are ſo completely changed, that the ruin of any one Power would be a ſerious misfortune to his greateſt natural enemy, ſince it would produce a diminution of that force, the whole of which ſhould be employed in the general defence? And that they have no other alternative than to ſuſpend all their differences, or to be conſumed in the general conflagration, which ſpares neither friend nor foe?

It is not poſſible, after what has happened, that any Power can be inſenſible of theſe in-

controvertible truths; and, therefore, unleſs it be decreed by Providence, that the moſt dreadful cataſtrophe of which the moſt gloomy imagination can form any idea, ſhall ſoon cloſe this awful ſcene, a new Coalition will ſpeedily be formed to defeat the malice, and to cruſh the ambition of the enemies of mankind. In that Coalition every State, which is not under the influence of the moſt dreadful infatuation, will be found. The voice of almoſt every nation, Monarchical or Republican, which has experienced the effects of peace or neutrality with France, proclaims aloud, that there is no ſafety, but in War, while that perfidious Republic is in being; and every nation, which does not hearken to that voice, deſerves to read its fate in that of Geneva, Switzerland, and the other Countries, which are groaning under the intolerable yoke of Gallic Deſpotiſm.

But far from a ſecond Coalition be the miſtake which has proved ſo fatal to the firſt. May no Member of the new Confederacy, forget for a ſingle moment, that, on the iſſue of the preſent conteſt, depend the preſervation of every thing valuable

valuable in life, and, indeed, the exiſtence of civil ſociety—and that, while the undoubted object of the enemy is the intire ſubverſion of every Social Inſtitution, his phyſical force derives, by a kind of reaction, its principal energy, from the moral force of that Revolutionary ſyſtem, which it is employed to eſtabliſh. Here conſiſts the prodigious ſtrength of this modern Sampſon; this is the true ſecret of his ſupernatural force; deprived of this reſource, he would be reduced to the ſtandard of ordinary vigour. It is, therefore, to the deſtruction of the revolutionary ſyſtem that every effort muſt be directed, both for the ſake of the immediate effect, and the ultimate object, of our exertions. It will not, however, ſuffice to aim at preventing the farther progreſs of that ſyſtem. It muſt be deprived of the fruits of its paſt ſucceſs. The torrent can only be checked by being driven back. Society cannot be preſerved by halves. The whole is attacked, and muſt either be ſaved or loſt. The revolutionary ſpoils of France muſt be wreſted from her graſp. The Empire of Anarchy muſt be overthrown. Nor is the enterprize ſo arduous, as at firſt ſight it may

may appear. The Republic of France, the ſeat of that Empire, poſſeſſes none of thoſe cements, which, alone, can give ſtabiſity to Empires. It is founded in fraud and deluſion, it is ſupported by terror and oppreſſion, and it is execrated by all, whom it holds in ſubjection. Wherever it has extended itſelf, it has, by the moſt unfeeling cruelty, the moſt unbounded rapacity, the moſt intolerable tyranny, carried with it conviction of the perfidy of thoſe promiſes, of freedom and happineſs, by means of which it facilitated its progreſs. The experience of French Fraternity has excited one uniform, ſettled, and implacable ſpirit of reſentment, and has rendered all mankind eager for revenge. Such a fabrick, coloſſal as it is, muſt be broken to pieces, like the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, the moment it is vigorouſly attacked. If the Powers of Europe were to unite, upon principles of ſound policy, and to act with firmneſs and vigour, they would ſoon ſee at their feet an enemy, who owes all his ſucceſs to the miſ-direction of their efforts,—to their indeciſion, and want of union and energy. They would then have a trial to undergo, far more difficult than that which had preceded their triumph. The hy-

pocrite, no leſs abject in adverſity than inſolent in proſperity, finding his deſtruction at hand, would endeavour to eſcape, by reſuming the maſk of moderation, and by holding out the lure of Peace. He would be inexpreſſibly anxious to ſtop the effuſion of human blood, which he had cauſed to flow in torrents, and to reſtore the repoſe of Europe, of which he had been the only diſturber. The fate of Society would depend upon that moment. If the Confederated Powers, inſtead of following up their blow, were to ſuffer themſelves to be deluded into the ſnare of Peace, they would ſoon fall a prey to thoſe artifices, which have proved fatal to ſo many of their neighbours, and to the ſucceſs of which, Peace is more favourable than War. They muſt therefore reſiſt the faſcination of repoſe, until the utter deſtruction of their enemy may enable them to repoſe in ſafety.

But in recovering the territories ſeized by the French Republic (if ſuch ſucceſs be deſtined to attend the combined arms), it muſt not be forgotten in what CAUSE they are recovered. They muſt not be conſidered as conqueſts, veſted by right

right of War in the victors. They muſt not be allowed to feed ambition. They muſt not even be employed as make-weights in the political ſcale, to reſtore, by ſome new arrangements, the balance which has been for a time deſtroyed. No; they muſt be conſidered as the means put by Providence in our hands, to effect the complete deſtruction of that Revolutionary power, which threatens with deſolation the whole habitable globe. That Power may ſtill triumph, although its ſpoils be wreſted from the French Republic, nay, although that Republic be overthrown, if, in conſequence of its ravages, any material change were to take place in the political ſtate of Europe. Of this its agents are ſo well aware, that where they cannot intirely diſorganize a Country, they eagerly ſeize every opportunity to diſturb and unſettle its ancient ties and connections; well knowing, that when the bonds, which have long holden together a community, are diſſolved, time alone can give durability to new ones. This is the deep policy of the French Revolutioniſts. This is the object of their newly-diſcovered ſyſtem of compenſations. Thus do they labour to undermine the

foundations of Empires, and in the midſt, nay, by the very terms of a nominal Peace, carry on their plans of univerſal deſtruction. To counteract ſuch miſchievous policy, it muſt be a firſt principle with the Powers, confederated for the preſervation of civil ſociety, to reſtore, as completely as poſſible, after ſo tremendous a convulſion, the former ſyſtem of Europe. The *ſtatus quo ante bellum*, that is before the French Revolution, (which was, from its commencement, a War upon the whole ſyſtem of civilized ſociety,) ſhould be their Polar Star, the invariable guide of their conduct.—They ſhould, as far as ſubſiſting circumſtances will permit, conſider as ſacred every pre-exiſting relation—every priſtine right—every immemorial uſage—every part of the Public Law of Europe—every former Government—every long-eſtabliſhed Conſtitution—in one word, whatever, till the burſting out of the French Revolution, had ſerved to connect people in States, or States in an harmonious and well-balanced ſyſtem of mutual intercourſe and dependence. Unleſs they act upon theſe principles, they will leave, not only the grounds of future contention among themſelves, but alſo the

germ

germ of future Revolutions, which French Revolutioniſts have ſo plentifully ſcattered.

In a matter of ſuch univerſal concern, embracing, not merely the eſſential intereſts of ſo many States, but the ſocial exiſtence of all Europe, a General Congreſs will, in all probability, be found neceſſary. But the buſineſs of ſuch a Congreſs will be to reſtore former arrangements, rather than to form new ones; to guard againſt any other change, than what may be indiſpenſably neceſſary to prevent a return of the ſubſiſting danger;—to replace the land-marks of States and Empires;—to make a grand alliance, for general and mutual defence, and thereby to provide againſt any future exploſion of the Revolutionary ſpirit, which, after ſo violent a fermentation, cannot be expected at once to ſubſide;—in fine, to remount the whole Political Machine, which has, for ſo many centuries, and by the ſafe and beneficial progreſs of gradual improvement, been advancing the proſperity of all civilized Nations. So ſhall the ſocial ſyſtem be ſnatched from the conflagration, by which it is ſurrounded,

and, like a Phœnix, riſe from the flames with renovated vigour.—So ſhall the reign of Law and Order emerge, with freſh luſtre, from the chaos, which had nearly overwhelmed it in the ſhades of eternal night.

N. B. The foregoing Prefatory Obſervations were written before intelligence was received, in this Country, of the immortal victory of the Nile. A victory, the moſt important and valuable, as well as the moſt ſplendid, ever yet achieved.—A victory over the ATHEISM as well as the ARMS of Republican France.—A victory, in ſhort, which has rouſed the Nations of Europe from the ſleep of Death; which facilitates, in an inconceivable degree, their triumph over their mortal enemy; and which promiſes, if rightly improved, to effect the Salvation of Civilized Society!

9 DE 63

CONTENTS.

# CONTENTS.

1. *THE Real Grounds of the preſent War with France—with a Poſtſcript.*

*The nature and tendency of the French Revolution. That event eſſentially hoſtile to the cauſe of Freedom. New Political Principles adopted by the French Republic. Decree of Fraternity in effect an univerſal Declaration of War. That Decree confirmed and aggravated by the Decree of Dec. 15. The deſigns of France to Revolutionize Great Britain proved from the open encouragement given by the Convention to the Seditious Britiſh Societies. Frivolous reaſons aſſigned by France to juſtify her Declaration of War. Hoſtile determination of France, and the pacific diſpoſition of this Country, proved from the Correſpondence with M. Chauvelin. Neceſſity of a General Confederacy of the European Powers.* Page 1.

2. *Objections to the Continuance of the War Examined and Refuted.*

*Arti-*

*Artifices employed to excite in the public mind an impatience for Peace, although the ſtate of France rendered Pacification impracticable. Fallacy of the arguments urged in favour of negociation with the French Republic. Peculiar intereſt of Commerce in the vigorous proſecution of the War—Falſe notions inculcated reſpecting the union, enthuſiaſm, and reſources of France. Danger of the Britiſh Conſtitution, not from the War, but from the machinations of faction, and the licentiouſneſs of the Preſs. An interference in the affairs of France for the purpoſe of reſtoring the French Monarchy, proved to be juſtifiable according to the Laws of Nations, and compatible with the independence and liberties of France.* Page 93.

3. *Reflections ſubmitted to the Conſideration of the Combined Powers.*

*The neceſſity of extraordinary vigilance and exertions on the part of the Combined Powers, collectively and individually. The means beſt calculated to inſure ſucceſs. The importance of the Nobility and Clergy of France to the general Cauſe.* Page 167.

4. *Farther Reflections ſubmitted to the Conſideration of the Combined Powers.*

*The*

*The Change produced in France by the Death of Robeſpierre not favourable to the cauſe of Society. The ſyſtem of moderation more dangerous than that of terror. The Reſtoration of the French Monarchy proved to be neceſſary for the preſervation of Europe. That Monarchy no Deſpotiſm. Claims of Louis XVI. to the gratitude of his people. Their return. The example of the Engliſh Reſtoration recommended to France. Artifices of the Republic to diſſolve the Confederacy. Firmneſs of Great Britain likely to prove the Salvation of Society.* Page 201.

5. *Thoughts on the Origin and Formation of Political Conſtitutions.*

*Cauſes which produced the Conſtitution of* 1795. *That Conſtitution not likely to be more durable than the preceding ones. Occaſion taken to expoſe the Folly of Conſtitution-making. The impracticability of the pretended right of the people to chooſe their Government. The French Revolution anomalous. Caſes of Rome and America. The ruinous ſyſtem, denominated "Modern Philoſophy," derived from Mr. Locke's Principles reſpecting the origin of Government. Thoſe painciples ſhown to be repugnant to nature, reaſon, and experience,—deſtructive of ſocial happineſs,—and in-*

*compatible with Civil Liberty. The natural growth of Conſtitutions. The only mode of acquiring Civil Liberty* *. Page 267.

6. *The Dangers of Premature Peace.*

*The exiſtence of France as a Republic incompatible with the Balance of Power. The miſchievous effects of Republicaniſm on Society. The French Republic deſtitute of the qualities repreſented, by the writers on the Law of Nations, as eſſential to the formation of Treaties. The eſtabliſhment of regular and permanent Governmentin France, an indiſpenſable Preliminary to Peace. Univerſal Ruin the certain conſequence of a General Peace with the French Republic.* Page 337.

* The Reflections on Mr. Locke's Syſtem from p. 290, to p. 322, are now firſt publiſhed

9 DE 63

THE

# REAL GROUNDS

OF THE

# PRESENT WAR

WITH

# *FRANCE.*

WITH

# A POSTCRIPT.

PUBLISHED IN MARCH,

1793.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

# REAL GROUNDS, &c.

A SURVEY of the actual ſituation of Europe is calculated to excite both the keeneſt ſenſibility, and the livelieſt apprehenſion, in the breaſt of every friend to humanity. It is not a common misfortune, nor an ordinary danger that we have to deplore—not merely the calamities of war, the deſolating fury of civil convulſions, nor even the ſhock of falling Empires: ſuch evils have often occurred; and, however dreadful in their progreſs and effects, they have gradually ſubſided, and, in the natural courſe of things, given way to peaceful and orderly ſcenes. But an evil, as unprecedented in its nature as alarming in its tendency, was reſerved for the experience of modern times; an evil which, beſides carrying in its train all the misfortunes that have hitherto

afflicted the human race, ſeems pregnant with miſchiefs that ſurpaſs all experience, and defy all remedy; an evil which threatens to ſubvert the very foundations of human felicity, and to occaſion the loſs of all the advantages reſulting from a ſtate of ſociety.

It muſt occur to every reader, that the event here alluded to is the French Revolution. A Revolution which has little in common with other Revolutions but the name; and which muſt be viewed in its relation to thoſe circumſtances which are peculiar to itſelf, in order to account for the unſpeakable miſchiefs which it has already produced, as well as for thoſe which it ſtill portends.

Hitherto a Revolution has operated no more than a change of perſons exerciſing the ſupreme power, or at moſt an alteration in the form of Government. Such change or alteration has, indeed, been generally accompanied with bitter animoſity, civil diſcord, and violent convulſion. But the conteſt over, theſe dreadful concomitants have diſappeared; Government has been transferred to other hands, or has undergone a variation in its mode of Adminiſtration. The ſenſe of mankind, however, has invariably admitted the neceſſity of ſome ſtable and efficient Government; and the very ſtruggle itſelf has

has recognized ſuch neceſſity. But the diſtinguiſhing feature of the French Revolution has been an endeavour to ſubvert, from its foundations, all legitimate authority. The fundamental principle of this remarkable event, is to abſolve mankind from all ties of duty and allegiance to eſtabliſhed Government, and to releaſe them from all obligations which have hitherto been conſidered as ſacred among men. This principle has ſucceeded under the falſe guiſe and borrowed name of Civil Rights; which have been uſed as pretexts to inflame the paſſions of the multitude, to miſlead their judgment, and to render them the inſtruments of general ruin.

If the miſchiefs which have reſulted from the adoption of this principle had been confined to France, they would afford a moſt ſtriking and awful leſſon to the reſt of the world; ſuggeſting that the greateſt misfortune a people can ſuffer, is to be freed from the reſtraints of Law and Government. Who, without horror, can behold a vaſt and populous country a prey to confuſion and diſorder—expoſed to all the outrages of mad ambition, wild fury, and inſatiable malice—affording no ſecurity but what is to be found in ſilence, concealment, or hypocriſy—under the dominion of terror, violence, and crimes—where diſſentions are compoſed

only by blood, and ſlaughter alone gives predominance to faction—where the ties of ſociety are all looſened, the feelings of nature and humanity obliterated, every ſocial duty and affection deſpiſed, the obligations of morality and religion ridiculed, and Infidelity and Atheiſm publicly avowed and applauded—where commerce and manufacture, induſtry and riches, public honour and private faith, civilization and urbanity, law and juſtice, have all diſappeared—where, in ſhort, the manners and habits of a once poliſhed and liberal people are become ferocious and ſanguinary, and their national character is degraded far below that of ſavages.—Such is the ſpectacle now exhibited by France! Such are the conſequences reſulting from the new principles which have been adopted in that diſtracted country! Conſequences which flow as naturally from ſuch a ſource, as night ſucceeds to day, or as the effect proceeds from the cauſe.

But beſides the influence of ſympathetic ſenſibility, the reſt of Europe has abundant reaſon on its own account to intereſt itſelf in the ſituation of France. The diſorders to which that country is a prey, are not only, themſelves, of a contagious nature, but the French people, inſenſible of their own delirium, ſeem eager to ſpread the infection, and to render all mankind as miſerable as themſelves. Like the Fallen

Angels,

Angels, they aſpire to no other happineſs than that of involving others in their own guilt and wretchedneſs. Torn and divided among themſelves, deſtitute of all internal ſources of union, they accord only in a wiſh to curſe their neighbours, by communicating their own ungovernable ſpirit of licentiouſneſs (moſt falſely termed Liberty), and by extending their wild and pernicious notions of abſurd and unattainable equality to every part of the globe. In ſuch objects only can they agree; by ſuch ties only can their diſcordant parties be united. They ſeem ſenſible, and with great reaſon, that it is only by extending the Reign of Anarchy abroad, they can maintain its Empire at home *; and that unleſs they ſucceed in ſuch an attempt, they muſt at length be compreſſed, and probably by a very painful proceſs, into a ſtate of order and coheſion. They are therefore indefatigable, beyond all example, in diffuſing the poiſon of their principles; in propagating their horrid "Rights of Man", and in exciting the

* It is an obſervation of Thomas Paine, that "when "France ſhall be ſurrounded with Revolutions ſhe will be "in peace and ſafety." In the ſame Revolutionary ſpirit, this remarkable promoter of peace and ſafety, at a meeting of the Revolution Society, (that Society which was ſo aptly termed "the Society FOR REVOLUTIONS") held at the London Tavern in November 1791, gave as his toaſt, "The Revolution of the whole WORLD."

ſeditious of every country to revolt and inſurrection: and wherever they can, by ſuch means, ſucceed in weakening the bands of ſociety, they inſtantly improve the advantage by the ſword, and, under the deluſory name of Freedom, eſtabliſh their own Empire by force of Arms. Conſidering their own country as the focus of diſorder and anarchy, they think themſelves entitled to make it the ſeat of univerſal dominion; pretending to erect the banner of Liberty, they endeavour to ſubjugate other nations to their own yoke: and, notwithſtanding the moſt pacific profeſſions, their thirſt for conqueſt is greater than has ever been excited, either by ambitious rage or religious frenzy.

THUS the ſyſtem purſued by theſe unprincipled madmen, with reſpect to other countries, bears a very cloſe analogy to that which prevails among themſelves at home. Having, in their domeſtic concerns, trampled upon all laws human and divine, and violated every ſanction of religion, honour, and humanity, they equally diſregard the obligation of thoſe engagements, which have been formed between different nations, with a view to mutual harmony and reciprocal ſecurity. The laws of nations are no more reſpected by them than thoſe of municipal authority, or of moral obligation. They conſider their own wild and ungovernable will

as

as paramount to the moſt ſolemn treaties; and by a vague and fictitious reference to natural rights, they pretend not only to ſet aſide the moſt poſitive ſtipulations, but alſo to abſolve other nations from their authority. But they do not ſtop here. With the moſt unſufferable arrogance, they preſume to regulate the internal affairs of other countries, and under the perfidious pretext of conferring liberty, to eſtabliſh their own ferocious and galling Dominion upon the ruins of every ſubſiſting Government. Thus do they attack the independence of other States, and arrogate to themſelves the right of giving Law to the whole world.

It may here be allowed to pauſe a moment, to deplore the injury which the cauſe of genuine Freedom has ſuſtained, from the horrid combination of events which forms the French Revolution; events which tend not only to check the progreſs of Liberty, but alſo, by abuſing its ſacred name, to prejudice and diſgrace it in the eyes of mankind.

At the commencement of that eventful period, France poſſeſſed a Monarch who had ſcarcely a wiſh but for the welfare of his People, and the proſperity of his Kingdom: a Monarch whoſe piety and virtues will attract the admiration of the lateſt poſterity. But a violent and profligate

ſligate faction ſought to raiſe themſelves to power and conſequence, by the propagation of the moſt wild and licentious principles, ſubverſive of all Government; and, having broken down all the fences which could reſtrain the paſſions and the vicious propenſities of mankind, led an inflamed, an infatuated, and a corrupted people from exceſs to exceſs, and from crime to crime, till they attained the very ſummit of atrocity, by imbruing their ſavage hands in the blood of their beneficent Sovereign.

It is not, perhaps, much to be wondered at, that the infamous perpetrators of ſuch crimes ſhould ſeek to facilitate the ſucceſs of their nefarious projects, by pretending to be engaged in the cauſe of Freedom, and by repreſenting every endeavour to check their pernicious progreſs (either by oppoſing the progreſs of their arms, or the propagation of their principles), as an effort of deſpotiſm to cruſh the liberties of mankind. But for any one in this Country to hold ſuch language, is the greateſt inſult that can be offered to a free and enlightened nation.

We know the value of Liberty, and we properly deteſt every ſpecies of arbitrary power; but we remember the ſlow and arduous progreſs by which our civil rights were eſtabliſhed

liſhed on a ſecure and permanent baſis; and we are aware that anarchy is much more hoſtile to genuine freedom, and much further removed from it, than deſpotiſm itſelf. The latter may reſtrain mankind from becoming free; the former renders them unworthy and unfit to be ſo: the one checks, indeed, the progreſs of Liberty; the other corrupts and deſtroys its eſſence. The paſſage from Deſpotiſm to Liberty is ſlow, gradual, and difficult;—it is however eventually certain, unleſs licentiouſneſs ſhould intervene, with its train of evils, infinitely worſe than all which tyranny can produce: but from anarchy to ſound and ſalutary freedom, there is no paſſage, but through the gloomy paths of the moſt ſervile ſubjection. For when mankind are once releaſed from the reſtraints of government, of law, and of order, they unavoidably become ſo wild, ungovernable, and vitiated, that nothing but the ſtrong iron hand of Arbitrary Power can bring them into any kind of regular ſubjection, or reſtore their capacity for the enjoyment of orderly freedom.

We are not left to conjecture, or inference, to diſcover the principles which France has adopted with reſpect to other nations. Scarcely was the new Republic eſtabliſhed upon the ruins of the Monarchy, when in the moſt formal manner,

ner, and in the moſt explicit terms, ſhe announced thoſe principles; and this not in an ebullition of rage, nor in a tranſitory fit of enthuſiaſm, but by a ſolemn Decree, deliberately confirmed by a ſubſequent act of the like nature—continued in force to this moment *—and uniformly adhered to, both in the ſpirit and the letter, from the inſtant of its promulgation. By the Decree of Fraternity, paſſed the 19th of Nov. 1792, the Convention openly avows the audacious project of exciting the people of every country to inſurrection, and promiſes them its aſſiſtance in their endeavours to throw off their lawful Government,

"DECREE OF FRATERNITY.

"SITTING ON THE 19TH NOV. 1792.

"The National Convention declare, in the "name of the French Nation, that they will "grant FRATERNITY *and aſſiſtance* TO ALL "PEOPLE who wiſh to recover their Liberty:

* N. B. This Decree has never been repealed. It has been invariably acted upon; and it unfolds the true principle of the conduct of France towards other countries, from the very commencement of the Revolution.

"and

"and they charge the Executive Power to ſend
"the neceſſary orders to the Generals to give
"aſſiſtance to ſuch People, and to defend thoſe
"Citizens who have ſuffered, or may ſuffer, in
"the cauſe of Liberty.

"DECREED to be printed IN ALL LAN-
"GUAGES."

The indignation which ſuch a Decree muſt neceſſarily excite, is almoſt loſt in aſtoniſhment, that it was not conſidered by the whole civilized world as an UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF WAR, and as a ſignal to every ſtate to riſe, as one man, to cruſh the power which openly avowed its intentions of working ſo much miſchief. Having thus diſclaimed every tie, by which nations have hitherto held themſelves bound to reſpect the rights and independence of each other—having thus declared its deſign of invading other countries, for the expreſs purpoſe of encouraging and aſſiſting inſurrection, and without any ſubſiſting ground of quarrel—having thus actually endeavoured to ſtimulate the people of every country to rebellion—France had no longer any terms to expect from other Governments. On the contrary, all Governments became inſtantly—not only intitled—but bound—by every conſideration of honour, ſafety, and of regard for the

welfare

welfare of their ſubjects—to repel, and to puniſh, in the moſt exemplary manner, an act of ſuch accumulated inſolence and injury, of ſuch complete, flagrant, and unjuſt aggreſſion.

The pretext of beſtowing liberty, on which France aſſumes the right of interference in the affairs of other countries, is only an aggravation of her conduct in paſſing this Decree; if indeed that conduct be ſuſceptible of aggravation. For ſuch a pretext is intended only to facilitate the execution of her deſigns, by affording a plea to the wicked, and by endeavouring to impoſe on the weak and uninformed part of every community. In truth, nothing can be more inſolent and domineering than this pretext, which aſſumes as a fact that every other people is in a ſtate of ſlavery, and which thereby preſuppoſes the caſe, to which the offer applies, to exiſt already in every country in Europe.

It is plain therefore, that the Decree of the 19th of November 1792, called *the Decree of Fraternity*, when tranſlated into accurate language, and explained by the principles and conduct of France, is nothing leſs than a direct offer of aſſiſtance to the diſaffected ſubjects of every State, and an aſſurance that, upon a favourable occaſion, they ſhall be

openly aided to bring their Country into the ſame ſtate of diſtraction and uproar, as France herſelf exhibits to the world. Nay, ſo eager was the Convention to give ſpeedy effect to this plan of univerſal inſurrection, that, by the Decree in queſtion, the Executive Council was charged to give the Generals the neceſſary orders to aſſiſt ſuch nations, and to defend ſuch citizens, as had been, or might be, perſecuted in the cauſe of Liberty: while, to prevent any doubt of the unlimited extent of the Decree, an amendment propoſed by a Deputy, that it ſhould be applicable only to thoſe people on whoſe territory the Armies of the Republic had already entered, was inſtantly rejected; and it was ordered *to be printed in all languages.*

There is abundant reaſon to conclude that the Convention, relying upon the repreſentations of Engliſh Traitors, expected the above infamous Decree to have a prompt execution in this Country. For in leſs than two months, when the Britiſh people had vindicated themſelves from the aſperſions which had been caſt on their loyalty, and had teſtified, in a ſignal manner, their inviolable attachment to their King and Conſtitution, the French Miniſter, M. Le Brun, endeavoured to evade the juſt remonſtrances of the Britiſh Government, and to ſoften the Decree by a pretended explanation of its purport and

tendency.

tendency. This explanation affords a fair ſpecimen of the artful colourings by which the French Republic is ever ready, when it ſuits her purpoſe, to gloſs over her language and her conduct, without, in the ſmalleſt degree, renouncing the injurious and ſubverſive principles, which invariably form the ſpring of all her actions.

By this explanation the Miniſter denies the intent of the Decree to be *to encourage and favour the ſeditious of all Nations*, and he pretends that its operation was meant to be confined to "the ſole caſe in which the general "will of a Nation, clearly and unequivocally "expreſſed, ſhould call the French Nation to "its aſſiſtance and fraternity." He alſo endeavours to rebut the charge that it was the object of the Decree to excite and foſter ſedition, by defining ſedition to be "the move-"ment of a ſmall number againſt the nation at "large," and by declaring that the aſſiſtance of France was promiſed only to a "whole people, "and not to a part." But the Decree, far from containing any expreſſions tending to reſtrict its application to the caſe mentioned in the Explanation, promiſes, in the moſt general and unqualified terms, aſſiſtance to *all* people who ſhall *wiſh* to *recover* their Liberty, "*qui voudront recouvrer leur Liberté*;" which is preciſely

ciſely the kind of language that is calculated to cheriſh and expand the ſeeds of diſcontent and ſedition, which are to be found in every Country, but not at all applicable to the caſe of an unanimous expreſſion of the general will; and the order to print the Decree in all languages, proves indiſputably that it was intended as an invitation to all perſons, to apply for the proffered aſſiſtance.—That the Decree in queſtion is incompatible with the above explanation, will further appear from the direction it contains to the Executive Power, to ſend the neceſſary orders to the Generals to carry it into prompt execution, by giving "aſſiſtance to ſuch people," and, by defending "*thoſe citizens*, who have ſuffered, or who may ſuffer, in the cauſe of Liberty." Can ſuch orders, particularly in the terms in which they are here directed to be given, be made to accord with the reſtriction of the Decree to the caſe of an application from a *whole people*, for the aſſiſtance of France?—Are the *Generals* to be the *Judges* of the queſtion, whether the application proceeds from a whole people, or a part? or is there the leaſt hint or ſuggeſtion to them, that any ſuch inquiry is to be made? No, they are inſtantly armed with authority, at their own diſcretion, to defend—not merely a people—but "thoſe Citizens" (*i. e.* any part of a people), "who HAVE SUFFERED "or may ſuffer in the cauſe of Liberty." Be-

 ſides,

ſides, the pretended reſtriction of the promiſed interference to the caſe of a whole people, ſoliciting for aſſiſtance, is a moſt glaring ſubterfuge; for the queſtion, Whether ſuch ſolicitation proceeds from a whole people, or a part, (a queſtion, in itſelf, ſubject to the greateſt ambiguity) is left to the arbitrium of France: and the attention which ſhe has paid to the Addreſſes of ſeditious Societies here (ſome of which Societies were not even known to exiſt till they were brought into notice by the Convention), proves to demonſtration, that ſhe would conſider thoſe turbulent and diſaffected perſons, who are to be found even in the beſt-regulated States, however few and inſignificant they might be, as expreſſing the general voice. The newly-conſtructed Gallic optics are admirably contrived to magnify the diſaffected part of a State, ſo as to make it appear to be the whole. Indeed, the claim of thinking and ſpeaking for the community at large is invariably urged by perſons of that deſcription; and the rhetorical figure which makes a part ſtand for the whole, is no where in ſuch general uſe as among the partiſans of Sedition *.

ADMITTING, however, for the ſake of argument, that the Decree was, in itſelf, capable of the conſtruction put upon it by the French Miniſter, in his official Note of the 7th of Ja-

* See p. 38.

nuary

nuary 1793, ſtill a regard for the dignity and independence of this Country rendered it impoſſible to accept of ſuch an Explanation, which, when viewed in its true light, is no leſs objectionable than the Decree itſelf; for it perſiſts in maintaining the right, claimed by France, to interfere in the internal affairs of other Countries: and though it pretends to limit the exerciſe of that right to a particular caſe, yet, as the exiſtence of that caſe is referred only to the judgment of France, ſuch a limitation amounts to nothing, and the claim ſtands abſolute and unreſtricted. Indeed, a claim of that nature cannot be recognized in any ſhape, or under any pretence. If, in *any* reſpect, but particularly in a matter of ſuch concern to a people as the form or exiſtence of their Government, one Country could claim a title, under whatever colour, to intermeddle in the domeſtic concerns of other Nations, the latter would entirely loſe their freedom and independence. For it is eſſential to a free and independent State, to be ſubject to no foreign control or influence whatever, in the regulation of its internal affairs; and if, by the intervention of any other Power, the Government of a Country were to be changed or new modelled, from that moment ſuch a Country would loſe all title to independence, and, inſtead of acquiring Civil Liberty, would be reduced to the moſt degrading ſervitude,

that of ſubjection to a foreign yoke. Pretences as plauſible and ſpecious as that, on which the interference was firſt made, would eaſily be found for its continuance; and the unfortunate people, after the recent example of the Belgians, would realize the fable of the ſheep, which exchanged their protecting dogs for devouring wolves.

The claim, therefore, aſſerted by France, even in her Explanations, is daring and preſumptuous in the extreme, and muſt be repelled by every State, that has any regard for its political independence, or its domeſtic freedom and ſecurity. Such a claim, if carried into effect, would reduce all other Countries to a Colonial ſtate, and render them dependent upon France. If the Decree of the 19th of November might juſtly be conſidered as an univerſal Declaration of War, the Explanation of that Decree is no leſs than an aſſertion of Univerſal Sovereignty. The pretence, on which this claim is founded, far from affording any qualification, is, perhaps, the moſt dangerous that could have been advanced. If France, as the general diſpenſer of Liberty, were authoriſed to ſay to other Governments, "*You are deſpotic and muſt be demoliſhed*," nothing more would be neceſſary to make her the miſtreſs, nay, the tyrant of the world. Such a pretence could be eaſily borrowed

borrowed on all occaſions; it is ſo vague and indefinite that no country could, in any poſſible ſituation, guard againſt it; and, being ſupported by force, no place would be found unſuitable, no time unfit, for its application.

The extreme jealouſy which France has ſhewn with reſpect to any interference of other Nations in her own concerns, (although in her ſituation it would have been the greateſt bleſſing to have obtained, by *any* means, a ſettled and regular Government) furniſhes the moſt pointed explanation of her views in ſeeking to eſtabliſh a caſe, in which ſhe may, at pleaſure, interfere in the domeſtic affairs of other States. By thus denying to them the ſame meaſure which ſhe ſo ſtrenuouſly claims for herſelf, ſhe fully proves the injuſtice, as well as the ambition, by which ſhe is actuated. It is impoſſible not to notice the contraſt to ſuch conduct, which has been exhibited by Great Britain, who, during the whole Revolution, has obſerved a ſtrict neutrality, a generous and magnanimous forbearance, with regard to France; neither inſulting the misfortunes, intermeddling in the concerns, nor taking advantage of the diſtreſſes of that diſtracted country;—a conduct the more noble, as it ſucceeded the injuries we had recently received from her, during the American diſpute. After having, however, returned good

for evil, we have, in our turn, been recompenſed by the blackeſt perfidy—by the moſt atrocious and injurious attempts to deſtroy our internal quiet; and at length, becauſe we are not a people to ſacrifice our dignity, and to give up our independence and ſecurity, we are driven into a war; but, of this war, innumerable memorials of Britiſh ſpirit, valour, and conduct, prognoſticate the moſt glorious ſucceſs, and the moſt happy and honourable iſſue.

It has been thought eſſential to diſcuſs, ſo fully, the Decree of Fraternity, becauſe that Decree ſeems to afford the touchſtone of explanation as to the conduct and views of France, with reſpect to all other Countries. A great variety of facts have concurred to ſhew, that the real intent of this Decree correſponded cloſely with the import which it obviouſly bears, and which England, and, indeed, all Europe had uniformly aſcribed to it. Nor can it be conſidered in any other light than as an aggreſſion againſt the tranquillity, the honour, the freedom, and the independence, of every other State. By aſſuming the ſpecious, though ſhadowy pretext, of granting aſſiſtance to all Nations in recovering their Liberty, it became infinitely more dangerous and hoſtile than an avowed intention of ſubjecting them to the dominion of France; for ſuch was the artful and

inſidious

inſidious nature of that pretext, that it was calculated, by exciting ſedition, to create the very caſe, to which it was meant to refer; and by affording a diſguiſe, it tended to promote the ſucceſs of that ambition, which, by an open diſplay, would have been entirely fruſtrated. Under the maſk of Religion the arms of Mahomet eſtabliſhed the empire of the Saracens—and under the maſk of Liberty the French ſeek to eſtabliſh the infinitely more formidable empire of Anarchy. But, ſurely, at the cloſe of the Eighteenth Century, mankind are not to be deluded into a belief that either true Religion or true Liberty can be propagated by force of arms.

If the Convention had ſtopped here, it would have ſtill done enough to excite the indignation and to rouſe the vengeance of all Europe. But fearful, as it ſhould ſeem, of not having been ſufficiently explicit, by another Decree, dated the 15th of December 1792, it reduces the general plan, promulgated by the Decree of Fraternity, into a regular ſyſtem, and furniſhes the detail of that proceſs, by which other States are to be diſorganized and broken up, and their Government, Inſtitutions, Laws, Uſages, and Conſtituted Authorities, entirely aboliſhed.

By the Decree of Fraternity the general right of invaſion was fully aſſerted, and the artful pretence of giving Liberty was aſſumed, as an univerſal paſſport for the French Arms. By the Decree of the 15th of December the Convention traces the plan by which the operation of beſtowing Liberty is to be performed; an operation ſo deſtructive, both in its progreſs and reſult, as was never before deviſed by the malice or tyranny of man. A few paſſages of this Decree will beſt ſpeak for themſelves.

"National Convention, *Dec.* 15, 1792.

"The National Convention, after having "heard the report of the united Finance, Mi- "litary, and Diplomatic Committees, faithful "to the principles of the Sovereignty of the "People, *which will not permit them to acknow- "ledge any of the inſtitutions militating againſt "it*, and willing to fix the regulations to be ob- "ſerved by the Generals of the Armies of the "Republic, in thoſe countries to which they "may carry their arms, decree:

"Article I.—In thoſe countries which are "or ſhall be occupied by the Armies of the "French Republic, the Generals ſhall imme- "diately proclaim, in the name of the French "Nation,

" Nation, the abolition of all exiſting impoſts " or contributions; of tithes; of all feudal " and manorial rights, fixed or caſuāl; of all " real or perſonal ſervices; of the excluſive right " of hunting and fiſhing; of ſtate labour; of " the Nobility; and generally of all privileges:— " they ſhall declare to the People, that they " bring them peace, ſuccours, liberty and equa- " lity.

" ARTICLE II.—THEY ſhall proclaim the So- " vereignty of the People, and THE SUPPRESSION " OF ALL EXISTING AUTHORITIES; they ſhall " then convoke the people in Primary Aſſemblies, " to create and organize a Proviſional Admi- " niſtration; they ſhall cauſe the preſent Decree, " and the Proclamation hereto annexed, to be " publiſhed and affixed in the language or dialect " of the country, and TO BE EXECUTED without " delay in every Diſtrict.

" ARTICLE III.—All the Agents and Officers " of the former Government, Military or Civil, as " well as the individuals lately reputed Noble, and " the Members of any Corporation lately privi- " leged, ſhall, for the firſt election only, be in- " admiſſible to any place in the Proviſional Ad- " miniſtration or Judicial Power.

" ARTICLE

"ARTICLE IV.—THE Generals ſhall forth-
"with place under the protection and ſafeguard of
"the *French Republic*, *all property*, moveable or
"immoveable, belonging to the Prince, to his
"voluntary *abettors*, *adherents*, or attendants; to
"the Bodies and Communities, both Civil and
"Religious; they ſhall cauſe to be drawn up,
"without delay, an exact ſtate thereof, which they
"ſhall tranſmit to the Executive Council; and
"they ſhall take every meaſure in their power to
"cauſe ſuch property to be reſpected."

THIS may be called, with great preciſion, the Article providing for confiſcation, plunder, and pillage.

THEN follows a variety of clauſes, ſpecifying further *minutiæ* of this audacious plan: but the laſt Article furniſhes the clue to the whole, and diſplays in the cleareſt light the real deſigns of France againſt the rights and independence of all Nations.

"ARTICLE XI.—THE French Nation declare,
"that IT WILL TREAT AS ENEMIES THE
"PEOPLE WHO, REFUSING OR RENOUNCING
"LIBERTY AND EQUALITY, ARE DESIROUS
"OF PRESERVING THEIR PRINCE AND PRIVI-
"LEGED CASTS, OR OF ENTERING INTO AN
"ACCOMMODATION WITH THEM. The Na-

" tion promiſes and engages not to lay down
" its arms until the Sovereignty and Liberty of
" the People, on whoſe territories the French Ar-
" mies ſhall have entered, ſhall be eſtabliſhed, and
" not to conſent to any arrangement or treaty
" with the Princes and privileged perſons ſo diſ-
" poſſeſſed, with whom the Republic is at war*."

WHILE

* It is curious to compare this article with the Declaration of LE BRUN, that the Convention only meant to grant aſſiſtance to a people, for the purpoſe of effectuating their general will, and in compliance with their expreſs deſire, and that France knew how to reſpect other Governments, and did not wiſh to impoſe laws upon any one.—*Original note.*

Further proof cannot be wanted of the perfidy which dictated theſe Declarations; but it deſerves to be noticed, that on the very day, on which the Memorial containing them bore date, the Executive Council iſſued general inſtructions to certain Commiſſioners, who had been appointed to carry the Decree of Dec. 15, into execution in the Netherlands; in which inſtructions the mode of executing each article of the Decree is preſcribed. In alluſion to the 11th Article, the Executive Council obſerve, that " it is evident that
" a people ſo fond of their chains, ſo obſtinately wedded to
" their degradation, as to refuſe to be reſtored to all their
" rights, are the accomplices, not only of their own deſpots,
" but even of all the crowned uſurpers who divide among
" themſelves the dominion of the earth and of its inhabi-
" tants; that ſo ſervile a people are the declared enemies, not
" only of the French republic, but alſo of every other na-
" tion; that every thing impoſes on us the obligation of
" exerciſing towards ſuch a people, all the rigours of war,
" and the rights of conqueſt, &c." (See a letter to Lord

Lau-

WHILE by this Decree the Convention erects itſelf into a General Aſſembly legiſlating for the whole human race, in vain ſhould we ſearch the Annals of the World for an Edict of ſuch rapacious, ruinous, and inſulting Deſpotiſm.

HITHERTO the conduct of France has been chiefly conſidered as it affected the common welfare and ſecurity of all Nations. In this light

" Lauderdale by John Gifford, Eſq.") M. Le Brun, as one of the Executive Council, ſigned theſe inſtructions, and the very ſame man, on the very ſame day, ſigned alſo the Memorial, which aſſured the Britiſh Government, that the Decree of Fraternity was only meant to operate in caſe the general wiſh of a nation, clearly and unequivocally expreſſed, ſhould call the French nation to their aſſiſtance and fraternity, and that France knew how to reſpect other Governments, and did not wiſh to impoſe laws upon any one!—It is a fact, however incredible, that the Oppoſition in this country, contended in the moſt ſtrenuous manner, that the Britiſh Government ſhould repoſe confidence in theſe declarations and aſſurances. This was a remarkable inſtance of the deſperate lengths to which men may be carried by party views. But who would believe it poſſible that theſe men, inſtead of ſeeking to retrieve a part of their character by an acknowledgement that they were themſelves deceived (a conſtruction of which the utmoſt liberality is ſcarcely able to allow them the benefit,) ſtill perſiſt, with the moſt unbluſhing effrontery, in condemning Miniſters, becauſe they were not the dupes of French artifice and hypocriſy, which were ſufficiently manifeſt at the time, but to which, ſubſequent events have given the clearneſs of mathematical demonſtration.—*Note to the Collection.*

Great

Great Britain was equally intereſted in that conduct with other States, and came alike within the ſcope of French Principles and French Decrees. It would, indeed, be abſurd to ſuppoſe that an exception was intended in favour of this Country; though, ſuppoſing the beſt poſſible diſpoſitions to have exiſted in our behalf, it ſurely would not have been very congenial to the feelings of Engliſhmen to depend on the forbearance of our natural enemies, particularly after they ſhould have over-run all Europe, and taken the balance of Power into their own hands. But the fact, that England was diſtinctly as well as generally involved in the revolutionary plans of France, does not reſt on preſumption. The numerous efforts that have been recently made by our Gallic neighbours to excite the Britiſh people to inſurrection, by Emiſſaries ſent among them for that obvious purpoſe—by the conſignment to their ports of incendiary books (as if their own preſs had not been adequate to the purpoſes of ſedition)—and by the application of pecuniary incentives to revolt—afford convincing proofs that they were not neglected, nor in danger of being deprived of their ſhare of French Fraternity. Leſt, however, ſuch endeavours ſhould be aſcribed to the zeal of unauthoriſed Propagandiſts, the open, unreſerved, and recorded communication, which has ſubſiſted between the Engliſh Agents of ſedition, and the Convention, completely reſcues that *auguſt* body

body from the charge of inattention to the ſeparate intereſts of this Country. The hearty welcome beſtowed by them on every Engliſhman, who was baſe enough to violate his natural allegiance, and bold enough to avow himſelf a Traitor to his Sovereign—their cordial reception of Addreſſes, preſented at their BAR, from various Britiſh Societies, formed for the obvious purpoſe of ſubverting the Conſtitution, by the fraternal aſſiſtance of France—and the immediate and flattering reſponſes given to thoſe Addreſſes—are facts of ſo ſtubborn and unequivocal a nature as to defy miſconſtruction, and to render evaſion utterly impoſſible. It is due to the reader to preſent him with ſome extracts from this daring and perfidious correſpondence; which, while it proves that the views of France extended to the ruin of this country, evinces alſo that the Explanations given by the Executive Council reſpecting the Decree of Fraternity, were founded in inſincerity, and fabricated for the purpoſe of deluſion.

IN the month of November 1792 divers Addreſſes from Engliſh and Iriſh ſubjects were preſented to the Convention. The ſpirit and object of theſe Addreſſes will ſufficiently appear from the ſtatement of a few extracts. In one dated NEWINGTON, 31ſt of October 1792, and read in the Convention the 10th of November, are found the following paſſages:

"ILLUS-

"ILLUSTRIOUS Senators, dear friends, enlight-
"ened Legiſlators, we can inform you at this
"day, and with the trueſt ſatisfaction, that the
"impious enmity ſo long and malignantly kept
"up in the hearts of a generous people towards
"the French Nation, by the manœuvres and in-
"trigues of a PERFIDIOUS COURT, exiſts no
"more but in the hearts of the perverſe, who
"profit by abuſes.

"IT is with the warmeſt and moſt profound
"ſenſibility that we behold the ſucceſs of your
"arms in your undertaking to deliver from ſlavery
"and deſpotiſm the brave Nations which bor-
"der on your Frontiers: How holy is the hu-
"manity which prompts you to break their
"chains."

THE REVOLUTION SOCIETY in London, in an Addreſs dated the 5th of November 1792, after applauding in theory the anarchical principle that "all Nations have a right to give themſelves ſuch "a form of Government as their own wiſdom "may ſuggeſt," very explicitly unfold their notion of the practical application of that principle in the following choice ſentence:

"AND we feel an agreeable ſenſation in behold-
"ing that this RIGHT OF INSURRECTION has
"been

" been ſucceſsfully exerciſed in ſo large a coun-
" try as that of the French Republic."

THIS accords perfectly with the memorable expreſſion of one of the original promoters of the crimes and misfortunes of France, the MARQUIS DE LA FAYETTE, viz. " that INSURRECTION " IS THE MOST SACRED OF DUTIES."

AN Addreſs to the Convention from the VOLUNTEERS OF BELFAST, dated the 6th of November, is diſtinguiſhed by this devout and benevolent prayer:

" FOR the glory of humanity, may your De-
" claration of Rights* be *every-where put in*
" *practice!*"

BUT the purport and tendency of theſe Conventional communications were diſplayed with much more clearneſs and energy in an Addreſs read in the Convention November 7, 1792, and ſtiled " An Addreſs from ſeveral Patriotic Socie-
" ties in England †;" than which nothing could be

* See poſt. page 43, the genuine operation of the Declation of Rights.

† The Societies from which this Addreſs proceeded were, The Conſtitutional Society of Mancheſter; the Society of Reform in Mancheſter; the Society of the Revolution in Norwich; the Conſtitutional Independent Whigs; Friends of the People.

better

better calculated to aſcertain, whether France really meant to give encouragement to the ſeditious of other Countries, or merely, according to the explanation afterwards given, to liſten to "the ſolicitations of a whole people" for aſſiſtance in recovering their Liberty. The following paſſages deſerve particular notice.

"WHILST foreign plunderers ravage your ter-
"ritories, *an oppreſſed part of mankind*, forget-
"ting their own evils, are ſenſible only of yours,
"and beholding the preſent events with a diſturb-
"ed eye, addreſs their moſt fervent prayers to the
"God of the Univerſe, that he may be favour-
"able to your cauſe, *with which theirs is ſo inti-*
"*mately connected.*"

"DEGRADED by an oppreſſive ſyſtem of in-
"quiſition, the inſenſible but continual encroach-
"ments of which quickly deprived this nation
"of its boaſted Liberty, and reduced it almoſt to
"that abject ſtate of ſlavery from which you have
"ſo glorioufly emancipated yourſelves; FIVE
"THOUSAND ENGLISH CITIZENS, fired
"with indignation, have the courage to ſtep for-
"ward to reſcue their country from that oppro-
"brium which has been thrown upon it by the
"baſe conduct of thoſe who are inveſted with
"power."

" FRENCHMEN! our numbers will appear very " ſmall, when compared with the reſt of the na- " tion; but *know that it increaſes every day*; " and if the terrible and continually elevated arm " of Authority overawes the timid; if falſehoods, " every moment diſperſed with ſo much induſtry, " miſlead the credulous; and if the public inti- " macy of the Court with Frenchmen, avowed " traitors to their country, hurry away the ambi- " tious and unthinking, we can with confidence " aſſure you, Freemen and Friends, that know- " ledge makes a rapid progreſs among us."

" ENDEAVOURING to diſcover our cruel ene- " mies, we have found them in the partiſans of " that deſtructive Ariſtocracy by which our bo- " ſom is torn; an Ariſtocracy which has hitherto " been the bane of all the Countries of the earth. " You have acted wiſely in baniſhing it from " France."

" WE ſee alſo, without concern, that the Elec- " tor of Hanover unites his troops to thoſe of " traitors and robbers; but the King of England " will do well to remember, that England is not " Hanover: SHOULD HE FORGET THIS, WE " WILL NOT FORGET IT."

THE reception given to the above Addreſſes puts it beyond all doubt, that the Convention might

might be juſtly charged with " the deſign of " favouring the ſeditious of Great Britain, and " of making the cauſe of a few private indivi- " duals that of the French nation," notwith- ſtanding the poſitive denial of ſuch a deſign, in the Explanation given by Monſ. LE BRUN to the Decree of the 19th of November. The Ad- dreſſes were ordered to be printed, and copies of the laſt (undoubtedly as being the moſt explicit) to be ſent to the Armies and to all the Depart- ments; and the Preſident of the Convention read a moſt favourable anſwer, of which it will ſuffice to extract one ſentence—" The ſentiments of " 5000 Britons devoted openly to the cauſe of " mankind, exiſt without doubt IN THE HEARTS " OF ALL THE FREEMEN IN ENGLAND."

To do juſtice, however, to the extenſive and generous views of the Convention, which have been ſo much narrowed and miſrepreſented by Monſ. LE BRUN, it will be ſtill neceſſary to ſee at their Bar the Engliſh Citizens JOHN FROST and JOEL BARLOW, and to attend to the following Addreſs of this *par nobile fratrum*, delivered on the 28th of November 1792.

" CITIZENS of France, We are deputed by a " Patriotic Society in London, called " The So- " ciety for Conſtitutional Information," to congra- " tulate you in its name upon the triumphs of Li-

" berty. Before the epocha of your Revolution, " this Society employed itſelf but too long upon " this important object with little hope of ſucceſs. " Judge from thence of the tranſports of its gra- " titude, when, thanks to the wonderful efforts of " the French Nation, it has beheld the Empire of " Reaſon extend and ſtrengthen itſelf, and aſſure " to virtuous men, by ſecuring the happineſs of " their fellow-creatures, a recompenſe to their fu- " ture labours. *Innumerable Societies, of the* " *ſame ſort, are forming themſelves at this mo-* " *ment in every part of England.* The minds " of all receive from this circumſtance a general " impreſſion, which leads them to fathom the " abuſes of Government, and to ſeek the means " of remedying them—means as ſimple as the " abuſes are intricate. After the example given " by France, *Revolutions will become eaſy:* Rea- " ſon is about to make a rapid progreſs, and it " would not be extraordinary if, in a much " leſs ſpace of time than can be imagined, *the* " *French ſhould ſend Addreſſes of Congratula-* " *tion to a National Convention of England*.*

" We

* Great pains are now taken to deny the exiſtence of ſeditious practices in this Country at the period in queſtion. But can better evidence be required to that point, than the Declarations of thoſe very perſons who were obviouſly planning, in concert with France, the ſubverſion of our Conſtitution; who publicly avowed, that *innumerable Societies were forming*

" We are alſo inſtructed to acquaint the Con-
" vention, that the Society which we repreſent
" has ſent 1000 pair of ſhoes to be preſented as
" a patriotic gift to the Soldiers of Liberty:—
" theſe ſhoes are at Calais. The ſame Society
" will ſend 1000 pair a-week for the ſix next
" weeks, for the ſame purpoſe."

This Addreſs from two *Engliſh Citizens* was but the precurſor of another Addreſs, which, it ſeems, thoſe Envoys were deputed to preſent to the Convention from an Engliſh Society, ſtiling itſelf (probably by way of *antitheſis)* the " Society
" for Constitutional Information in Lon-
" don." The latter Addreſs, which was read by the Secretary, contained the following ſtriking paſſages:

" Representatives of a Sovereign People,
" and Benefactors of Mankind! We rejoice that
" the French Revolution has arrived at that de-
" gree of perfection which will permit us to ad-
" dreſs you by theſe titles; they are the only ones

*forming themſelves, at that very moment,* upon the ſame principle, *in every part of England*; and who were confident of the ſpeedy approach of the time when *the French ſhould ſend Addreſſes to a National Convention of England?*

" that can accord with the character of true Le-
" giſlators.

" EVERY ſucceſſive epocha in your political
" regeneration has EACH added ſomething to the
" triumph of Liberty; and the *glorious victory*
" *of the* 10*th of Auguſt* has finally prepared the
" way for a Conſtitution which, enlightened as
" you are, we truſt will be eſtabliſhed on the baſis
" of Nature and Reaſon."

" THE events of every day are proving, that you
" have gained the opinion of all the Nations placed
" near you on the Continent; that a majority of
" each of thoſe Nations are really your friends;
" that their apparent enmity is only a temporary
" conſequence of the violence exerciſed againſt
" them by their Governments; and that they
" only wait to be delivered by your arms from the
" neceſſity of fighting againſt you."

" OUR Government has all the power, and, per-
" haps, the inclination, to employ hireling pens
" to contradict us; but we believe, in the ſince-
" rity of our hearts, that we now ſpeak the
" ſentiments of *a majority of the Engliſh Na-*
" *tion* *."

* See page 18.

" THE

" THE ſparks of Liberty preſerved in England " for ſeveral ages, like the lights of Aurora Bo- " realis, ſerved only to diſcover to the reſt of Eu- " rope the darkneſs which covered it. A ſtronger " light, image of the real Aurora, ſhone forth " from the boſom of the American Republic, but " its diſtance prevented it from enlightening your " hemiſphere. It was neceſſary that the French " Revolution, beaming forth in the full fervour " of a meridian ſun, ſhould ſuddenly diſplay in " the midſt of Europe the practical reſult of the " principles, which *Philoſophy* had ſown in the " ſhade of meditation, and which Experience " every where confirms."

" OTHER Nations will ſoon follow your ſteps in " this career of improvement, and riſing from " their lethargy, will arm themſelves for the " purpoſe of claiming the Rights of Man, with " that all-powerful voice which Man cannot " reſiſt."

So far from either the Speech or the Addreſs above cited being at all repugnant to the *anti-ſeditious* views of the Convention, both were honoured with long and general applauſe.—The Preſident, animated by congenial feelings, made a moſt encouraging reply, wherein he thus, in part, addreſſed himſelf to the worthy Repreſentatives of the CONSTITUTIONAL SOCIETY:

"SPIRITED Children of a nation which has "been celebrated through the two hemiſpheres, "and which has afforded illuſtrious examples to "the univerſe, you offer us more than your wiſhes, "ſince the fate of our warriors has been thought "deſerving of your anxiety.—Thoſe who now de- "fend our liberty will one day become the de- "fenders of yours. You were already entitled to "our eſteem, you are now entitled to our grati- "tude; and Freemen will never forget what they "owe to the Engliſh Nation.

"The ſhades of Hampden and of Sydney "hover over your heads, AND THE MOMENT, "WITHOUT DOUBT, APPROACHES, IN WHICH "THE FRENCH WILL BRING CONGRATULA- "TIONS TO THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF "GREAT BRITAIN.

"GENEROUS REPUBLICANS, your ap- "pearance among us prepares a ſubject for hiſtory. "That day will be noticed, in which Citizens be- "longing to a nation long the rival of France, ap- "peared in the midſt of the Aſſembly of the Re- "preſentatives of the French People, in the name "of a crowd of their fellow-countrymen."

To conclude this embaſſy in the moſt reſpect- ful manner, the Deputies from the Conſtitu- tional Society were admitted to the honour of

of a Sitting, amidſt unbounded applauſe; the Preſident of the National Convention was directed to write a letter of thanks to thoſe generous Iſlanders, for the patriotic gifts which they had juſt offered to the Armies of the Republic; the Speech, the Addreſs and the Anſwer of the Preſident, were ordered to be printed and ſent to the Eighty-three Departments, and to be tranſlated into all languages; minutes of the proceedings were alſo directed to be delivered to the Deputies, and the patriotic gift to be accepted, and tranſmitted to the Miniſter at War.

After ſo much fraternal communication acroſs the Channel, it was natural to expect that thoſe Engliſhmen, whoſe reſidence at Paris afforded them an opportunity of being regularly initiated into the bloody rites of the French Revolution, ſhould offer their incenſe on the Altars of Anarchy. Accordingly, on the 28th of November, a Deputation from the Engliſh and Iriſh at Paris appeared at the bar of the Convention, and as ſoon as loud and long reiterated plaudits would permit, the Spokeſman addreſſed the *auguſt* Senate in a ſpeech of which the following is a part:

"Citizen Legiſlators, the Britiſh and Iriſh "Citizens actually at Paris, conſtantly animated "by thoſe principles which have given birth and "ſucceſs to the French Revolution, aſſembled

" themſelves laſt Sunday, for the purpoſe of " celebrating the ſucceſs of your arms; and they " have determined to preſent to you their con- " gratulations upon events which afford ſo favour- " able an omen to thoſe Nations who are deſirous " of becoming free.

" THE diſgraceful memory of thoſe pretended " Governments, the offſpring of the combined " fraud of Prieſts and Tyrants, will in a ſhort " time alone remain.

" OUR wiſhes, Citizen Legiſlators, render us " impatient to behold the happy moment of this " great change, in the hope that on its arrival we " ſhall ſee an intimate union formed between the " French Republic and the Engliſh, Iriſh and " Scotch Nations: nor are we alone animated by " theſe ſentiments: we doubt not that they would " be equally conſpicuous in the great majority of " our fellow-countrymen, if the public opinion " were to be conſulted there, as it ought, IN A " NATIONAL CONVENTION.

" As for us who now reſide at Paris, we gladly " take this opportunity to declare, that during " the whole courſe of the Revolution, and not- " withſtanding the abrupt departure of our Am- " baſſador, OR RATHER THE AMBASSADOR OF " THE COURT OF LONDON, we have conſtantly

" expe-

" experienced the utmoſt cordiality and openneſs,
" and the moſt ſincere friendſhip on the part of
" the French Nation."

THE Preſident's reply contained the following nervous and ſignificant paſſage:

" PRINCIPLES are waging War againſt Tyran-
" ny, which will fall under the blows of Philo-
" phy. Royalty in Europe is either deſtroyed,
" or on the point of periſhing on the ruins of
" feodality; and the Declaration of Rights placed
" by the ſide of Thrones, is a devouring fire
" which will conſume them. * *(applauſes)*
" Worthy Republicans, congratulate yourſelves
" on thinking that the feſtival which you have
" made in honour of the French Revolution, is the
" prelude to the feſtival of Nations. The Con-
" vention offers you the Honours of the Sit-
" ting."

THE Deputation croſſed the Hall in the midſt of applauſes.

IT is fair to conclude, that the Engliſh and Iriſh, from whom the laſt mentioned Addreſs proceeded, propoſe, as ſoon as their foreign education ſhall be finiſhed, to return home, and practiſe the leſſons they learned on the 10th of Auguſt,

* See ante page 32.

the

the 2d and 3d of September 1792, and the other memorable days, which ornament the Calendar of the French Republic.

It merits particular notice, that, among the Agents emyloyed to carry on the ſeditious negociation between the diſaffected Engliſh and the Convention, appears no leſs a perſon than Mr. LE BRUN HIMSELF—that Miniſter for Foreign Affairs who afterwards declared officially, in explanation of the Decree of the 19th of November, that it was foreign to the views of France, and inconſiſtent with the Decree of the 19th of November, to give encouragement to the ſeditious of other Countries, and that France knew how to reſpect other Governments. The following extract from a letter of the above Miniſter, read in the Convention on the 29th of November, deſerves to be produced in evidence, as well upon the queſtion of his own ſincerity in his ſubſequent communication with the Britiſh Government, as in further proof of the diſpoſition of France to encourage and excite a ſpirit of inſurrection in this country.

" It is pleaſant for me to add, that this devo-
" tion to the cauſe of the French Republic be-
" comes general among the Engliſh People. The
" Addreſſes which I have been directed to tranſ-
" mit to the National Convention are a ſtriking

" proof

" proof of it. Even yeſterday I received from a " Society which conſecrates its time to the eſta- " bliſhing the Empire of Liberty and Equality, " and which would place its happineſs in being " able to contribute to the Union of two Nations, " which have been too long enemies, a Reſolution " taken in its ſitting of the 20th of this month, of " which the following is the tranſlation."

THEN follows the Reſolution above referred to, which LE BRUN ſo faithfully, ſo ſpeedily, and ſo cordially tranſmitted to the Convention :

" THE Society having been informed that Mr. " Lyndſay is diſpatched to Paris without any " Diplomatic Character, which announces that the " Engliſh Miniſtry acknowledges the French " Republic ;

" RESOLVED unanimouſly, that this Society " devotes to the contempt, the hatred, and the " indignation of the true Friends of Liberty, the " Agents of a corrupt Adminiſtration, who have " the audacity to depute to the Miniſters of a " Free People a perſon named Lyndſay, with a " threatening, inſulting meſſage, with a view of " obtaining conditions which would diſhonour " the Majeſty of the French People, and make " it abandon the cauſe of thoſe people who are

" ambitious

" ambitious of receiving from it the gift of " Liberty.

" RESOLVED, That the Preſident of the Society " do invite all the Friends of Equality, all the " Correſponding Societies in France, to employ " their zeal, their efforts, and their ſolicitations with " the Executive Council, and in particular with " the Citizen Miniſter for Foreign Affairs, that " they will not receive or acknowledge the inſo- " lent meſſenger Lyndſay, and that they will re- " fuſe all communication with the Britiſh Cabi- " net, until it has acknowledged the Sovereignty " of the French People, and driven from the " Court the infamous CALONNE, that firebrand " and odious inſtigator, that intriguing friend of " Deſpotiſm, and malevolent Agent of an infa- " mous Party.

" RESOLVED alſo, That the Society ſhall " continue its ſittings twice a-week, and that " thanks ſhall be given to the Citizen DE LA " CHESNAYE, for his indefatigable zeal in " procuring us light, intelligence, and ſubjects " of information."

To preclude all doubt as to the authenticity of the above communication, LE BRUN thus concludes his Letter:

" THESE

"THESE Reſolutions have been paſſed by the "Society eſtabliſhed at ROCHESTER for the Pro-"pagation of the Rights of Man."

THE effect of the above Letter is conſiderably heightened by the circumſtance, that the Society at Rocheſter, from which the above Reſolutions proceeded, was ſo inſignificant as not to be at all known at that place; and, after various fruitleſs reſearches, it has been found to conſiſt only of three or four obſcure individuals. But nothing that tends to inſult and menace the Government of this Country is too inſignificant for the fraternal notice of the Convention *.

MUCH

* The extracts above preſented to the Reader diſplay, in a ſtriking manner, the open encouragement afforded by France to the diſaffected part of the Britiſh Nation. Such extracts, therefore, as they relate to acts of groſs inſult and direct aggreſſion, are cloſely in point upon an inquiry reſpecting "The Real Grounds of the War:" but from a paper ſigned by CONDORCET, and publiſhed in the Chronicle of Paris on the 23d of November 1792, it appears, that our inveterate Gallic foes did not rely ſolely for the ſucceſs of their incendiary plans upon the *direct* efforts of ſedition, but that they depended alſo upon the more cautious machinations of thoſe perſons who, under the pretence of Reform, ſought to undermine the very foundations of the Conſtitution. The following paſſages of the paper alluded to deſerve particular notice, as they contain a very uſeful warning to the people of this country:

"Since

MUCH more than ſufficient has been already ſtated to convince the moſt incredulous of the hoſtile diſpoſitions of France, and of her endeavours to ſpread among us the ſeeds of diſcord and revolt, for the purpoſe of ſubverting our Government, and preparing us for the reception of French

" Since the exploſion of Liberty in France, a hollow fer-
" mentation has ſhewn itſelf in England, and has more than
" once diſconcerted all the Miniſterial operations. Popular
" Societies have been eſtabliſhed in the three Kingdoms, and
" a Parliamentary Reform has been talked of, juſt in the ſame
" manner as, at the end of the year 1788, we (in France)
" talked of the neceſſity of calling together the States Ge-
" neral. It is well known what a number of perſons there
" are who think rightly, and *daily enlighten* the people of
" England, and whoſe opinions furniſh ſubjects for uſeful
" diſputation. This people, who at once fear and deſire
" ſuch a Revolution as ours, will neceſſarily be drawn
" along by thoſe courageous and enlightened perſons who
" *always determine the firſt ſteps; the opening of the Seſſion of Par-*
" *liament, which approaches, will infallibly become the occaſion of*
" *the reforms which are the moſt urgent; ſuch as thoſe which re-*
" *gard the National Repreſentation*—FROM THENCE TO THE
" ENTIRE ESTABLISHMENT OF A REPUBLIC."

The advocates for Parliamentary Reform always leave us in the dark (thoſe who mean well are in the dark themſelves) reſpecting the real extent of their plans. Eager to begin the great work, they ſtudiouſly keep out of view the important conſideration *how it may end.* CONDORCET is much more explicit. He unfolds at once the plot and the *denouëment*—and candidly traces the progreſs of Reform to its final cataſtrophe " the entire eſtabliſhment of a " REPUBLIC."

Liberty

Liberty. Still, however, a kind of diſguiſe was occaſionally aſſumed—thread-bare and tranſparent, indeed—but meant in ſome ſort to cover the ultimate deſign, till matters ſhould be more ripe for its completion. But in a letter of Monſieur MONGE, Miniſter of the Marine, to the Sea-Ports, dated the 31ſt December 1792, all reſerve is laid aſide, and the maſk, which had been before alternately taken off and reſumed, is thrown quite away.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM THE MINISTER OF MARINE TO THE SEA PORTS, DATED PARIS, DEC. 31, 1792.

" THE Government of England is arming, " and the King of Spain, encouraged by this, is " preparing to attack us. Theſe two Tyrannical " Powers, after perſecuting the Patriots on their " own Territories, think, no doubt, that they " ſhall be able to influence the judgment to be " pronounced on the Traitor Louis. They hope " to frighten us: but no; a People who has " made itſelf free; a People who has driven out " of the boſom of France, and as far as the diſtant " borders of the Rhine, the terrible army of the " Pruſſians and Auſtrians; the People of France " will not ſuffer laws to be dictated to them by " any Tyrant.

"THE KING AND HIS PARLIAMENT MEAN "TO MAKE WAR AGAINST US. Will the "ENGLISH REPUBLICANS SUFFER IT? Already "theſe free men ſhew their diſcontent, and the "repugnance which they have to bear arms "againſt their Brothers, the French. Well! WE "WILL FLY TO THEIR SUCCOUR: WE WILL "MAKE A DESCENT IN THE ISLAND: WE "WILL LODGE THERE FIFTY THOUSAND "CAPS OF LIBERTY: WE WILL PLANT THERE "THE SACRED TREE: AND WE WILL STRETCH "OUT OUR ARMS TO OUR REPUBLICAN "BRETHREN. THE TYRANNY OF THEIR GO-"VERNMENT WILL SOON BE DESTROYED. "LET EVERY ONE OF US BE STRONGLY IM-"PRESSED WITH THIS IDEA.

(Signed) "MONGE."

AFTER ſuch accumulated evidence of the unbounded ambition of France in general, and of her particular views of aggreſſion and hoſtility againſt Great Britain, the Government of this country would have ſhewn itſelf a very inattentive guardian of the National honour and intereſts, if it had ſuffered itſelf to be entrapped into confidence and ſupineneſs, by the deluſory explanations of Monſieur CHAUVELIN and the Executive Council: explanations, calculated only to amuſe, and which could not have been accepted, without affording a ſanction to thoſe principles and proceedings,

ceedings, which had given ſuch ground for offence and alarm. There never was a period, at all diſtinguiſhed for its importance, when the *general line of duty* was ſo plain on the part of Adminiſtration. No room was left for option, nor, ſcarcely, for deliberation, as to the part to be taken. The conduct of France had been ſo daring, inſulting, and aggreſſive, and the *avowed* principles of that conduct were ſo ſubverſive of the harmony and quiet of Europe in general, as well as of the ſafety, order, and independence of every State, that no explanation or diſavowal could afford ſatisfaction for the paſt, or ſecurity for the future. Any thing ſhort of a revocation of the obnoxious Decrees—a derelict-tion of the conquered territories—a recal of the French armies—an expreſs renunciation of all views of aggrandiſement, and aggreſſion, of all right to violate or diſturb ſubſiſting Treaties, and of all claims to interfere, upon *any* pretence, in the internal concerns of other Countries—any thing ſhort of this would have left the political ſyſtem and the domeſtic tranquillity of all Europe at the mercy of a people, who had diſclaimed all reſtraints of honour and juſtice, whoſe ambition was rivalled only by their perfidy, and whoſe inſolence, increaſing with their ſucceſs, had arrogated the imperious right of dictating to the whole world.

But ſo far from any diſpoſition being manifeſted, by the perſons exerciſing the Supreme Power in France, to make the above indiſpenſable conceſſions, they maintain, even in their explanations with this Country, the injurious principles upon which they had acted, and of which we had complained. They inſiſt, with only an artful and evaſory change of terms, on a right to ſubvert all other Governments, in a ſuppoſititious caſe, of the exiſtence of which they make themſelves the ſole judges. By defending their unprovoked aggreſſion on Holland (a neutral Power, and an ally of Great Britain) in the affair of the Scheldt, they avow a claim of annulling at pleaſure the moſt ſolemn Treaties, and of violating the rights even of neutral Nations. They perſiſt in this aggreſſion, and declare their intention to continue ſo to do without any redreſs, not merely during their war with another Power, but till a period the moſt indefinite and undefinable ſhall arrive, "the conſolidation of the "Liberty of the Belgians." They even menace * War, if ſuch explanations *as theſe* ſhould be deemed by us inſufficient—if our language in return thereto ſhould be ſuch as they may chuſe to call haughty—or if *we ſhould even preſume to put ourſelves in a poſture of defence, while France, with an armed force of half a million of*

* See Le Brun's Memorial, delivered to Lord Grenville by Monſieur Chauvelin, January 13, 1793.

*men*

*men at her command (not to mention her naval preparations) was over-running a great part of Europe, and making daily additions to her immenſe territories.* To render theſe *conciliatory* advances complete, they are followed by the inſolent menace of* *appealing to the People againſt the lawful Government of Great Britain.*

WHERE had been the ſpirit and the dignity of this Country, if ſuch inſolence had been received with complacency, and ſubmitted to with tameneſs? No one who has a Britiſh heart in his boſom will, in any poſſible event, remember with regret that we did not bend the knee to the inſolent and upſtart uſurpers of France, who had acquired their power by rebellion, who retain it by the influence of terror, and who employ it in deeds at which Humanity ſtands aghaſt. Still, however, while dignity characterized our Councils, and firmneſs diſtinguiſhed our meaſures—while we declared our reſolution to accept no terms but ſuch as would reſtore tranquillity and ſecurity to Europe, and preſerve the independence of its reſpective States—and while we perſevered, with unremitting activity, in forwarding

* Le Brun, in his Report to the Convention on the 19th of December 1792, ſays, "We will not fail to make a "ſolemn appeal to the Engliſh Nation:" a ſuggeſtion which *did not fail* to produce great applauſe.

thoſe naval preparations, the neceſſity of which has been ſince ſufficiently evinced—we diſplayed a readineſs, even to the laſt, to avert the calamities of war, and to hearken to any propoſals which might be conſiſtent with the indiſpenſable objects we had in view. Thus Lord GRENVILLE, in his Anſwer of the 31ſt of December to the Note preſented by Monſieur CHAUVELIN, ſays, "It "would have been with pleaſure that we ſhould "have ſeen here ſuch explanations, and ſuch a "conduct, as would have ſatisfied the dignity "and honour of England, with reſpect to what has "already paſſed, and would have offered a ſufficient "ſecurity in future, for the maintenance of that "reſpect towards the Rights, the Government, "and the Tranquillity of Neutral Powers, which "they have, on every account, the right to expect." Nay, even at the moment immediately previous to the commencement of hoſtilities, Lord AUCKLAND (at the *Hague*) received directions from his Majeſty to accede to the propoſal of DUMOURIER for a conference on a particular day; though that ſcheme was altogether fruſtrated by the unreſtrainable eagerneſs of the Convention to begin the war: a ſtrong proof of the impoſſibility of negociating with an Aſſembly, ſo raſh and precipitate in its reſolves, and ſo regardleſs of every eſtabliſhed form and rule. In ſhort, while nothing was omitted, on our part, in the way of neceſſary preparation for an event which, from the

conduct of France, ſeemed more than probable, ſo nothing conſiſtent with national honour and ſound policy was neglected, to obviate the neceſſity of that event; nor has a ſingle meaſure been adopted by us, not even among thoſe by which France affects to have been provoked to declare war againſt Great Britain, which was not either a requiſite precaution for our immediate ſecurity, or neceſſary to preſerve that character and conſequence as a people, without which no ſecurity can long ſubſiſt.

THE recal of Lord GOWER, when his miſſion was *ipſo facto* determined, by the depoſition of the Sovereign to whom he was ſent, and when Paris exhibited ſuch a ſcene of uproar and confuſion, that he could not have remained there without expoſing his perſonal ſafety, (any violation of which would have been much more likely to produce a rupture than his recal)—the reſtrictions laid on the exportation of corn to France, when that country was endeavouring to drain us of this valuable commodity, for the double purpoſe of ſupplying its own urgent wants, and of reducing us to diſtreſs—our precautionary endeavours, by means of the Alien Bill, to preſerve our Conſtitution from the machinations of thoſe agents of inſurrection, who were daily flocking here, in great numbers, to inſtruct our people in the Revolutionary art—Our omiſſion inſtantly to acknowledge an upſtart Republic, which

poſſeſſed no kind of ſettled authority, which exhibited no powers but what were proviſional, and which was founded on principles eſſentially hoſtile to every ancient and eſtabliſhed Government—our refuſal to ſend an Ambaſſador to the Ephemeral Authorities in France, and to commit the Royal Dignity, by expoſing a Plenipotentiary of the Britiſh Crown to a diplomatic conteſt with the accredited Envoys of ſeditious Engliſh Clubs—and, finally, the diſmiſſion of Monſieur CHAUVELIN, who, by the murder of his Sovereign was become a private individual; and whoſe intrigues with the factious and diſaffected in this country, rendered him a very improper perſon to be permitted to reſide here.—Such were the pretexts by which France endeavoured to juſtify, in the eyes of the world, her attack upon this country: but it is plain that, in all theſe reſpects, our conduct was regulated by the moſt obvious and indiſpenſible maxims of policy and prudence, and that it afforded to France no juſt ground of offence, or complaint, however diſpleaſing to her it might be, by fruſtrating the miſchievous deſigns which ſhe had formed againſt our internal ſecurity and our conſtitutional independence.

IT is true, the Declaration of War by France contained an aſſignment of other reaſons equally frivolous

frivolous and abſurd—ſuch as our prudent precaution in guarding againſt the moſt unſtable, precarious, and ill-founded, of all paper currency, French Aſſignats—our obſerving the outward teſtimonials of reſpect cuſtomary upon the death of a Foreign Sovereign—our not refuſing the rights of hoſpitality to the perſecuted French emigrants, with divers other pretences, which the perſons in this country, who loſe no opportunity of vindicating French principles and politics, and of criminating the conduct of Great Britain, have found it impoſſible to dignify with ſerious notice.

In a Declaration of War ſo founded, ſupported, and explained, it is impoſſible not to diſcover that decided pre-determination for hoſtility, which is never at a loſs for pretences to diſturb the peace of Nations. But although the Declaration, taken by itſelf, aſſigns no motives at all adequate to account for the conduct of France, in proceeding to an open rupture, this deficiency is amply ſupplied by a reference to the previous meaſures purſued by the rulers of that country. A ſingle glimpſe of their ſyſtem of Fraternity and univerſal Revolution—their arrogant Decrees—their notorious communication with the ſeditious of this Country—their threatened vengeance againſt Monarchy in general—and their audacious menaces againſt our own gracious

cious Sovereign *—a ſingle glimpſe of theſe things diſpels all obſcurity, and places their Declaration of War, with its grounds, its motives, and its objects, in full and open day.

NOTWITHSTANDING ſuch a ſeries of unprovoked, inſolent, and intolerable aggreſſions on the part of France, followed up by a Declaration of War, and a moſt † perfidious commencement of hoſti-

* It has been ſaid in the Convention by Danton, that "they had thrown down a King's head as a gauntlet to the "Kings of Europe, and that the ſcaffolds erected in Weſt-"minſter Hall for the eternal trial of Mr. Haſtings, would "ſerve for the Miniſters, and even for ****** himſelf."

† The arrogance and injuſtice of France in exciting war, can only be equalled by the baſeneſs and perfidy of the means ſhe employs in its proſecution. She ſeeks by treachery to deprive her opponents of every mode of fair defence; and, inſtead of relying on the vigour of her efforts or the valour of her troops, ſhe endeavours to make the conteſt unequal, by throwing off every reſtraint of honour and principle, and by diſregarding thoſe ties, by which the reſt of mankind deem themſelves bound. Thus did ſhe not only begin the war by ſeizing thoſe Engliſh veſſels which had entered her ports in confidence, and which were therefore entitled to the protection of the laws of Nations, but alſo, by a ſolemn Decree, ſhe held out a temptation to the Britiſh Sailors to become traitors and pirates, by carrying the veſſels they are engaged to defend into French ports. Indeed, the preſent war, in every point of view, is remarkably diſtinguiſhed from all wars which have ever preceded it. Never did any Belli-

hoſtilities, the Convention do not ſcruple to claim the merit of having "exhauſted all means, compa-"tible with the DIGNITY OF THE REPUBLIC, "to avoid extremities." After what has paſſed, nothing which that Aſſembly can ſay or do is capable of exciting ſurprize. But it exceeds belief that Engliſhmen ſhould be found, ſo deſtitute of all regard for truth and decency, ſo dead to all ſenſe of ſhame, as to contend that we were the aggreſſors in hoſtility, and to aſcribe the exiſtence of the war to our interference in the internal affairs of France.

After the generous neutrality and forbearance which this Country had manifeſted from the commencement of the French Revolution, no further evidence can ſurely be wanted to prove

Belligerent Power purſue objects ſo extenſively and irreparably ruinous as thoſe *avowed* by France, nor reſort to ſuch means to attain ſucceſs as that country has the baſeneſs to employ. It is, therefore, abſurd to reaſon, in the preſent inſtance, from analogy to former wars. New evils muſt be encountered by new remedies; and though this Country will never loſe ſight of thoſe principles of honour, urbanity, and juſtice, by which it has ever been diſtinguiſhed, yet at this moment prudence and ſelf-preſervation call for novel and extraordinary exertions, adapted to the exigency of the caſe, and calculated effectually to defeat the inexpreſſibly miſchievous deſigns of the enemy.

the

the injuſtice of ſuch an inſinuation *. The truth is, that the charge of interference, which is ſo unjuſtly brought againſt us, is fully and ſolely applicable to the conduct of the French rulers, who, beyond all diſpute, ſought to direct the domeſtic affairs of every other Country, and to render their revolutionary principles univerſally predominant: and whatever their advocates may alledge, the only thing we had to determine was whether, while in the full enjoyment of all the advantages of a regular Government, and of a free, a happy, a long eſtabliſhed and much-beloved Conſtitution, we ſhould allow *them* that right of meddling in our domeſtic affairs, which we did not think ourſelves intitled to with reſpect to France, though a prey to confuſion and anarchy?

THE queſtion, Whether it has been in the power of Great Britain, on *any* terms, to prevent actual hoſtilities? may excite the curioſity of a Speculatiſt, but can furniſh no important ground of inquiry for the Politician. For it is clear, beyond all controverſy, that War was only to be

* The diſbanding of the naval armament prepared in the contemplation of a rupture with the Empreſs of Ruſſia, whether that act was in other reſpects conſiſtent with ſound policy, conſidering the then ſtate of Europe, proves to demonſtration that our views towards France were pacific.

averted

averted by means incompatible in every view with the dignity and eſſential intereſts of this Country. To have purchaſed a continuance of peace, we muſt have brooked paſt inſults, and, thereby, have courted freſh ones—we muſt have connived at the unbounded projects of French Ambition, the alarming progreſs of French Arms, and the ſtill more alarming propagation of French Principles—we muſt have abandoned the intereſts of our Allies, broken our faith to them, renounced the obligation of Treaties, and given up our weight in the ſcale of Europe—we muſt have ſacrificed our honour, dignity, and conſequence—we muſt have tamely ſubmitted to ſee our rights trampled upon—our internal tranquillity invaded—our King and Conſtitution menaced and inſulted—and all the ſources of our own ſecurity, as well as of that of all Europe entirely cut off!—Finally, after having, in compliance with the requiſition of Le Brun, diſcontinued our preparations, we muſt have waited patiently for our own turn to be fraternized; and, by ſuch a conduct, we might at length have been admitted to the honour of becoming a Department of France.

But it is pretended by thoſe who plead the cauſe of France, that we have not made a fair trial of the effect of negociation; that the diſpoſition, ſhewn by the Convention to treat, has been

been thwarted by the faſtidious diſtance preſerved by the Engliſh Government; and that, during the intercourſe which took place by way of negociation, we neglected to ſpecify, with ſufficient clearneſs and preciſion, the nature and extent of our demands; from all which it is attempted to be inferred, that it is impoſſible now to ſay what might have been the reſult, if we had manifeſted a more conciliatory diſpoſition. All this, if true, would have no weight in proving us the aggreſſors in hoſtility. But a peruſal of the Papers, which have paſſed between the Britiſh Miniſtry and the Agents of the Convention, will refute even theſe ſtatements, and convince every one, who is open to conviction, that a negociation has exiſted, which was adequate to every object that a negociation could obtain; that the deviation from accuſtomed forms, with which that negociation was accompanied, did not create any difficulty, nor even conſtitute any part of the queſtion diſcuſſed; that the refuſal on our part to ſend and receive a formal Ambaſſador (whether that refuſal was, in other reſpects, right or wrong), did not prevent a full and complete underſtanding of each other's ſentiments and views; that the point of *etiquette* was ſurmounted; and that the channel of diſcuſſion, *pro hac vice*, was as open, as if mutual Embaſſies had exiſted in all their forms. The language of Lord GRENVILLE

was

was alſo preciſe and intelligible, as to the grounds of complaint on the part of England. In his Memorial, wherein preciſion and clearneſs ſeem to vie with manly ſenſe and energy, the three cauſes of diſſatisfaction ariſing *from the Decree of the 19th of November—from the infraction of Treaties, the aggreſſion upon our Ally, and the violation of neutrality in the affair of the Scheldt* *—*and from the views of aggrandiſement manifeſted by France*, were detailed in terms the moſt explicit. Even upon the laſt of the three points, which in its nature was moſt liable to ambiguity and miſunderſtanding, what can be more pointed and ſpecific than the following paſſages in his Lordſhip's Letter of the 31ſt of December?

" THIS Government, adhering to the maxims " which it has followed for more than a century,

* Much has been ſaid by ſome perſons about the trifling importance of the Navigation of the Scheldt when put in competition with the horrors and calamities of war. But thoſe who argue in this way are careful not to take into the account the conſequence of recognizing France as the Sovereign Arbiter of Treaties, to confirm, invalidate, and diſſolve them at pleaſure; or, which is preciſely the ſame thing, according to her own pretended notions of natural rights. This, however, was the true point in the queſtion in the affair of the Scheldt: and that being the caſe, the conſideration of value was irrelevant: nor could we ſubmit to one ſuch precedent, however minute the inſtance, without being pledged to the recognition of the injurious principle on which it is founded.

" will

" will never ſee, with indifference, that France " ſhall make herſelf, *either directly or indirectly*, " Sovereign of the Low Countries, or general " Arbitreſs of the Rights and Liberties of " Europe.

" If France is really deſirous of maintaining " friendſhip and peace with England, ſhe muſt " ſhew herſelf diſpoſed to renounce her views of " aggreſſion and aggrandiſement, and to confine " herſelf within her own Territories, without " inſulting other Governments, without diſturb- " ing their Tranquillity, without violating their " Rights."

Any one is free to contend, that theſe demands were exorbitant, but no one can deny that they were explicit. On the other hand, the anſwers and explanations of France, however evaſory, ſufficiently indicated a determination to refuſe all ſatisfaction with reſpect to the points in diſpute: and, to put the matter out of all doubt, the French Miniſter gave in his *ultimatum*, declaring, that if we did not accept the explanations then offered (trifling and eluſive as they were), France would prepare for war with England *. Could any negociation have pro-

* Jan. 13, 1793. Mr. Chauvelin writes thus to Lord Grenville, " after ſo frank a declaration, which manifeſts ſuch a ſincere

produced more decisive language than this? Could any treaty have gone beyond an *ultimatum?* Could any discussion have terminated in a more precise point than that where one party says to another, "You must either accept my "answer, such as it is, and sit down, quiet and "satisfied, or *war* shall ensue?" It would be the height of absurdity to pretend, that the most polished refinement and splendid superficial of diplomatic intercourse could have produced a different result. Is there any one who can believe, for a moment, that France would have changed her system, renounced her plans, relinquished her principles, abandoned her conquests, and sacrificed her successes, out of compliment to a few forms? or, Is it credible that she would have accorded to our meanness and timidity, what she refused to concede to our dignity and firmness?

The circumstance of France having been willing to negociate and explain, notwithstanding the interruption of all regular intercourse with

sincere desire of peace, his Britannick Majesty's Ministers ought not to have any doubts with regard to the intentions of France. If her explanations appear insufficient, if we are still obliged to hear a haughty language, if hostile preparations are continued in the English Ports, after having exhausted every means to preserve Peace, we will prepare for War."

our Government, is relied on, and it is all that can be relied on in favour of the ſuppoſition that ſhe was diſpoſed to adopt pacific meaſures with regard to Great Britain. But was it not an important and deſirable object for her to be permitted to purſue, without any impediment from us, her ſchemes of conqueſt and aggrandiſement? To attain that object by explanations, tending to caſt a miſt over our juſt grounds of complaint, to conceal her principles and her views under a ſpecious veil of impoſing epithets, and to render the idea of war unpopular in this country, was certainly worth the experiment. However difficult it might be to deceive the vigilance and penetration of the Britiſh Government, it might be thought not impoſſible to impoſe on the good ſenſe, or the honeſt feelings of the Britiſh people, at leaſt with the aſſiſtance of thoſe perſons among us, who were ready to adopt and re-echo every kind of argumentative fallacy, that could be ſuggeſted by Gallic craft. The artifice has been fruſtrated by the ſpirit and diſcernment of this Country; and it is now plain, both from the progreſs and the reſult of the negociation, that no ſatisfaction whatever was intended, or could have been obtained.

## CONCLUSION.

THE foregoing review of the tranſactions leading to the preſent War, ſuggeſts a variety of important and uſeful reflections.

No inſtance has ever yet occurred in which War was attended with ſuch ſolid and ſatisfactory grounds for conſolation, nor with ſuch cogent motives for exertion and unanimity, as that in which we are now engaged. We may reflect with ſatisfaction, not merely that it was unſought by us, but that it was out of our power to avoid it; at leaſt without an entire ſacrifice of our National conſequence and reſpectability, and of our faith and honour as a People; and that, even by ſuch a ſacrifice, we ſhould in all appearance have only warded it off for the moment, and have had to encounter it hereafter, under circumſtances infinitely more diſadvantageous. We may alſo reflect, with ſome degree of ſatisfaction, that the calamities of war, great as they are, fall vaſtly ſhort of thoſe, to which we ſhould have been expoſed, if we had purchaſed preſent peace on the terms, which alone afforded us any chance of preſerving it.

THE queſtions, therefore, which are ſo current in the mouths of ſome men, What can we *gain*—what may we not *loſe* by the war? are calculated

only to miſlead, and to excite an unfair prejudice. Theſe queſtions falſely aſſume that we have had an option, and that war has been our deliberate choice. But nothing can be more obvious than that the war, both in form and in ſubſtance, is, on our part, A WAR OF DEFENCE.

But even to ſuch inquiries it may be ſatisfactorily anſwered, that if the proſperity of the country is ſuch, as to leave us nothing to wiſh for, nothing further to attain, the object of the War is no leſs than to preſerve and ſecure whatever we now poſſeſs; or, to borrow the energetic language of Mr. Powys, "we may gain by war all that we "have to loſe." Every thing which is or ought to be dear to us, is attacked—our foreign conſequence—our domeſtic tranquillity—our national honour—our political independence—our civil rights—and, to ſum up all in one word, our Constitution itſelf, the ſource of all our greatneſs, and of all our felicity—We have been hurried into a war becauſe we did not chuſe to ſacrifice theſe valuable intereſts; and it is now by war alone that we can place them beyond the reach of further inſult. Let ſuch conſiderations animate us to the utmoſt degree of ardour; let them call forth all our energy; and let every one forego the name, as he muſt diſgrace the character of an Engliſhman, who would harbour a thought of

Peace

Peace, until the objects of ſuch a War can be completely attained and ſecured.

IMPORTANT, however, as the war is in its object, and juſt in its principle, faction is buſily employed in endeavours to enhance its difficulties, to depreciate its advantages, to darken its proſpects, and to render it odious and unpopular. The inconveniencies, actually occaſioned by the war, are not only exaggerated, but miſchiefs are aſcribed to it, which aroſe from other ſources, and which it had no ſhare in producing.—Thus, while *public* credit ſuſtains itſelf with almoſt unprecedented vigour, the war is moſt abſurdly charged with the diſtreſſes of *private* credit—diſtreſſes which aroſe from the adventurous raſhneſs of commercial ſpeculation, and which were foreſeen by many, long before an idea of war was entertained. That war is a grievous and diſtreſſing calamity, ever productive of inconvenience and ſubject to diſaſter, none will attempt to dipute; but *that*, in which we are engaged, has the juſteſt poſſible claim to our manly and patriotic chearfulneſs under its burdens and difficulties, whatever they may be. For ſuppoſing the diſtreſſes of the war to exceed all that is ſuggeſted by craft, or predicted by fear, ſtill they would bear no kind of competion with thoſe evils, which it is the object of the war to

void, and which can only be prevented by its ſucceſs.

It is not, however, by ſelfiſh conſiderations alone, that we are called to exertion in the preſent war. The cauſe in which we are engaged is not partial, but general; the cauſe not of one, but of all.—It concerns not merely the ſeparate intereſts of individual States, but the common intereſts of all States.—Upon its ſucceſs depends the preſervation of Europe, and, probably, of the whole World:—upon its ſucceſs depends the important queſtion, Whether Government ſhall exiſt—Whether Religion ſhall retain any influence in ſocial life—Whether Laws ſhall continue to bind, and Juſtice be any where adminiſtered—Whether, in ſhort, any link of the ſocial chain ſhall be preſerved unbroken?—or, Whether mankind ſhall be uncivilized, and reduced to a ſtate of more than Gothic barbariſm, and the whole Earth become, like France, the licenſed Theatre of every crime?

When conſequences of ſuch magnitude depend upon the fate of our arms, it ſhould excite our gratitude to Divine Providence to be able to reflect, at ſuch a period, on the wealth and proſperity of the Nation—the extent of its reſources—the ſtrength and excellent condition of its natural bulwark, the Navy—the intrepid bravery of its Sea and Land Forces—the harmony of its People

—the energy of their character—and their zealous attachment, both to the perſon of their Sovereign, and to the Conſtitution of their Country. Our wonderful and almoſt miraculous progreſs, in a ſhort period of time, from diſtreſs and weakneſs to unprecedented ſtrength and proſperity, ſeems intended by the All-wiſe Diſpoſer of Events, as the means, not only of our own preſervation, but of reſtoring order and tranquillity to other Countries.

But, with all our own advantages, it is indiſpenſably neceſſary that we ſhould avail ourſelves fully of the aſſiſtance and co-operation of the other Powers, now engaged with us in the ſame conteſt. Our intereſt is cloſely linked with theirs in the event of that conteſt. We were not menaced till they were defeated; but no ſooner was the cauſe of France diſtinguiſhed by ſucceſs againſt them, than her inſolence broke out in thoſe daring outrages, which have ſo juſtly excited our alarm, and our indignation. A continuation of that ſucceſs would only render her more formidable, more inſolent, and more aſpiring. Should ſhe prevail in making them a prey to her ambition, we might then find her, with ſuch an acceſſion of ſtrength, even an overmatch for ourſelves; and it would be too much to hope, that we ſhould eſcape the vortex, which had ſwallowed up the reſt of Europe.

INDEED, the common welfare and ſecurity of all nations call loudly for the exertion of their united efforts, before it be too late, to check the progreſs, to chaſtiſe the inſolence, and to repel the ambition of France. The beſt intereſts of humanity—the well being, the exiſtence of ſociety are at ſtake. A common enemy ſhould be reſiſted by united force. It is alike the intereſt and the duty of every Government and of every people, to make common cauſe againſt a Power which ſtrikes at the root of all eſtabliſhed Government, and which ſeeks to ſubvert all conſtituted authority, and to deſtroy that neceſſary ſubordination which is the very baſis of ſociety.

THE ſucceſs, therefore, of the great cauſe in which ſo many nations are engaged, and which involves their deareſt intereſts, depends upon their acting together in a firm and well-cemented union. They are inſeparably connected in the ſame fate—they muſt ſtand or fall together. Till their common object be obtained—till their general ſecurity be effected, they ſhould form an indiſſoluble phalanx. The language of thoſe who call this a combination of Deſpots, to oppoſe the progreſs of Liberty, is as abſurd as it is falſe and miſchievous. The cauſe of Freedom had never ſo formidable an enemy as that ſyſtem of anarchy and oppreſſion which prevails in France, and which the rulers of that Country endeavour to render univerſal. It is only by cruſhing

that

that ſyſtem, that the avenues of Civil Liberty can be kept open.

In every point of view, therefore, the preſent ſafety, as well as the future and permanent welfare, nay, the political independence and civil liberty of all Europe, call, at this juncture, for its combined and vigorous efforts to defeat the ambitious and deſtructive projects of France—and to preſerve, by means of a general Confederacy, thoſe common intereſts of all States, without which no State can improve, or even retain, its ſeparate rights and advantages.

In ſuch a Confederacy it well becomes the Genius of Britain to preſide. The Guardian Genius of this favoured Iſle, the ſeat of genuine Freedom, and the Temple of Humanity, can never be more auſpiciouſly engaged, than in vanquiſhing the Fiend of Diſcord and Anarchy—and thereby reſtoring Tranquillity to Nations, and Security to Mankind.

# POSTCRIPT,

*Publiſhed in the Autumn of* 1793, *when the* FRENCH ARMIES *had not only been defeated in their Attacks upon* HOLLAND, *but alſo driven out of the* AUSTRIAN NETHERLANDS.

THE circumſtances which gave riſe to the preſent War are ſo novel and unprecedented, that ſome perſons have attempted to infer, that it is not attended with any preciſe object; and thoſe who were for endeavouring to avert it by the entire ſacrifice of our dignity, honour, and national conſequence, begin to be clamorous for its concluſion, now that the French are driven out of Holland and the Auſtrian Netherlands. But it is impoſſible to advert to the tranſactions which preceded, and the cauſes which produced the War, without ſeeing that it has an object, as preciſe as it is important, and that this object is neither more nor leſs than SECURITY. But, as *partial* ſecurity cannot exiſt, we are intereſted in providing for *that* of all Europe againſt the reſtleſs, turbulent, and incendiary ſpirit of French Revolutioniſts.

In the purſuit of ſo important an object, one thing is extremely plain, that the ſecurity we ſeek to eſtabliſh can never be obtained, until there be ſome regular, ſtable, and efficient Government in France. The unprincipled, tumultuary, and unorganized factions which domineer at preſent over that unfortunate country, can never be admitted as parties in any treaty, by which the rights, intereſts, and tranquillity of nations are to be regulated and ſecured. After aſſuming a power ſuperior to the obligation of treaties, how could they be depended upon for the performance of any terms, into which they might enter? After denying, both in principle and practice, the authority of the law of nations, to what ſanction could any ſtipulations made by them be referred, but their own arbitrary and capricious will? It would be the mereſt farce to treat with a Power, which avows no other rule of conduct than "*Sic volo—ſic jubeo—ſit pro ratione volantas.*" The ſtrong and numerous proofs which they have given of their perfidy, of their intire diſregard to every principle of honour and juſtice, and to every eſtabliſhed form and rule, muſt debar them of all confidence with civilized States. Beſides, with what dignity, with what decency, could any Government negociate with men whoſe lives are due to Juſtice for the moſt atrocious offences, which have ever ſtained the annals of the world?—with a ſet of banditti

ditti who have been the ſcourge, not only of their own country, but of the whole human race, and who hold their illegitimate power by a tenure, as precarious as it is unjuſt? What would be the effect of a peace concluded with ſuch men, but to leave them at liberty to reſume their revolutionary ſchemes, their incendiary conſpiracies, and their projects of univerſal confuſion? Were it poſſible for Great Britain to have the meanneſs to withdraw herſelf from the Confederacy, of which ſhe forms a part, and of which ſhe ought to be the animating ſoul, before the grand object of general ſecurity be attained, the common foe would inſtantly derive freſh courage and vigour, the baneful cauſe of Gallic Liberty and Equality would revive, and ſavage Fraternity would again expand its deſtructive arms, to embrace diſtant regions in its fatal claſp. Such dangers muſt not be permitted to recur; hereafter they may not be ſo effectually reſiſted as at preſent. The advantages already obtained, far from inclining us to relax, ſhould ſtimulate us to ſuch further exertions as may eradicate the evil, which is as contagious as it is malignant.

NOTHING, in ſhort, can warrant us to expect that ſecurity and tranquillity, which have been ſo much endangered, but the entire downfal of that anarchical Power, which, being erected in France

France upon the ruins of Government and Order, ſeeks to extend its Empire over the Globe; and which, among the calamities produced by it, has excited a general War. To ſheath the ſword before that Power is completely demoliſhed, would be to confirm its authority, to ſtrengthen its influence, and to invite its ravages. No terms can be made with a Power, the exiſtence of which is incompatible with the ſafety and quiet of the reſt of the world; and which, wherever it reſides, muſt be the centre of confuſion, and the focus of anarchy. But to ſuffer it to be eſtabliſhed in a country like France, and to have the reſources of ſuch a country at its command, would be to ſet at defiance the plaineſt dictates of wiſdom, and the moſt forcible ſuggeſtions of experience.

THE doctrine now contended for by no means implies a right in one country to interfere in the internal concerns of another. But France has adopted a ſyſtem which is as miſchievous to her neighbours as to herſelf; a ſyſtem, by which the rights and intereſts of other nations are not only inſeparably connected with her own, but are alſo made ſubſervient to her will. It therefore behoves other nations, in their own defence, to deſtroy that ſyſtem, root and branch; and by ſo doing they no more aſſume a right of regulating the internal affairs of France,

France, than a man who inſiſts on extinguiſhing a fire, in a houſe adjoining to his own dwelling, can be ſaid to regulate the domeſtic concerns of his neighbour's family.

AMIDST all the viciſſitudes with which the fortune of the War is chequered, it cannot fail to excite ſatisfaction in every Engliſh boſom, to reflect, that the honour of the Nation has not been tarniſhed, by liſtening to the degrading propoſal of conciliating the regards of the Convention. Suppoſing that any man in this Country, fit to repreſent the Crown of Great Britain, would have accepted of a miſſion to that aſſembly of traitors and regicides—ſuppoſing that by ſo humiliating a ſtep the bleſſings of peace could have been preſerved (a ſuppoſition utterly repugnant to reaſon,) the country would have incurred indelible diſgrace, its alliance would from that moment have ceaſed to be reſpectable, and it would have attracted the ſcorn and contempt of every other Power in Europe—even of thoſe Powers who have themſelves diſhonoured Society by their neutrality towards its implacable foes. The caſe of Cromwell has been much relied on, to juſtify the abaſing propoſal, to recognize the nominal Republic of France. But Cromwell, though an uſurper, knew how to make his own Government reſpected, and to reſpect other Govern-

Governments; in both which particulars he widely differed from the uſurpers of France.

THE moment will be as critical as important, when the French People ſhall have obtained their deliverance from their fell and ſanguinary Tyrants. Many, very many years muſt, indeed, elapſe, before the ravages of the Revolution can be repaired, and generations, yet unborn, will taſte the bitter fruits of the peſtiferous Tree of Liberty. But without extending our views ſo far, the taſk of eſtabliſhing order in France will be unſpeakably arduous. The dangers to be avoided will be as great as the evils to be remedied. The malady is not of a nature to admit of palliatives, and a relapſe will be inevitably fatal. It is the part of wiſdom to anticipate the difficulties of *that* moment, in order to be the better prepared to encounter them: for woe to Europe and to Society, if, for want of a complete remedy, the opportunity, whenever it ſhall occur, be ſuffered to eſcape.

MISCHIEFS of an enormous magnitude are to be repaired—but that is not all; the greateſt caution is neceſſary to prevent their being reproduced. It will not avail to do away conſequences, if cauſes be ſuffered to remain. The evil muſt therefore be traced to its ſource—

the

the wound muſt be probed to the bottom, and a radical cure muſt be begun, before France can be in a ſtate of convaleſcence. The preſent horrid Convention grew out of a Legiſlative Aſſembly, and *that* out of a Conſtituent Aſſembly; and *that* paved the way for all the evils which have followed, by the adoption and propagation of principles, deſtructive of all Order and Government, and incompatible with a ſtate of ſociety*. The wild ſpeculations, the baneful philoſophy, diſſeminated with ſuch induſtry at the commencement of the Revolution, were the germ of all thoſe miſeries and horrors, which have ſince grown up in ſo plenteous a crop. A Declaration of viſionary, abſurd, and impracticable Rights has been the Charter of Licentiouſneſs and Anarchy; and the attempt to realize the prepoſterous notion, that the Sovereignty reſides in the People, and can be exerciſed by them, has given riſe to the moſt cruel and oppreſſive tyranny that ever exiſted. In order to provide for the future hap-

* The attachment of theſe muſhroom and ſelf-conſtituted Legiſlators to their crude and fanciful ſyſtems was remarkably exemplified in an expreſſion of one of the leading Members of the firſt Legiſlative Aſſembly, viz. "*Periſſent plutot les colonies qu'un principe.*—Rather let the "colonies periſh than a ſingle principle."—After ſuch a ſpecimen of Legiſlative wiſdom, who can be ſurprized at the calamities of France?

pineſs of France, the road that led to her preſent miſery muſt, be ſtudiouſly avoided. The ſame cauſes would again produce the ſame effects, and it would be in vain that the Convention were extirpated, if any thing like the preceding Aſſemblies were reſtored, or their principles adopted. It would be in vain the heads of the Hydra were cut off; other heads would ſoon ſprout up, ſtill more voracious than their predeceſſors:—the vitals of the monſter muſt be pierced, and its renovating power deſtroyed—the whole fabrick of the Revolution muſt be demoliſhed, its foundations razed, and the rubbiſh ſwept away—Departments, Diſtricts, Cantons, Municipalities, and Clubs—the whole ſyſtem, in ſhort, of organized diſorder, muſt be annihilated, before France can begin to recover her tranquillity, or recruit her natural ſtrength. The ancient diviſion, the provincial boundaries of France muſt be reſtored—an immenſe debt of juſtice muſt be diſcharged both to the oppreſſor and the oppreſſed—the fictitious Rights of Man muſt give way to the real Rights of Nature and the Duties of Subjects—the voice of Religion muſt be once more revered—the authority of the Laws reſpected, and the ſanctions of Morality enforced—the Throne and the Altar muſt be again erected—Society muſt be again arranged in due gradations, its various ranks and orders muſt

muſt be replaced, and a Power muſt be eſtabliſhed, of ſufficient ſtrength to connect the whole, and to maintain the parts in their proper places.

It ſeems almoſt incredible that any perſon ſhould be deſirous of again reſorting to the ſpeculative Conſtitution, begun by the National Aſſembly in the year 1789;—a Conſtitution which was a mere fabrick of fancy, formed upon no model of experience, plentifully gloſſed over, indeed, with metaphyſical varniſh, but ſo looſe, disjointed, and inapplicable, that it fell to pieces as ſoon as it was tried: a Conſtitution without either a connecting or a balancing principle; containing an Executive Magiſtrate without ſtrength to enforce the execution of the laws—a Monarchy without means of defending the Crown—and a phantom of Royalty, ſet up to be inſulted and degraded at the pleaſure of the multitude—in ſhort, a Conſtitution which, beſides its practical defects, was founded upon the abſurd principle, that thoſe to govern ſhould be ſubordinate, and thoſe to be governed ſupreme. It required no great degree of diſcernment to diſcover, at once, that ſuch a ſyſtem, like an inverted pyramid, would quickly fall. But after the experiment has failed—after it has not only failed, but been followed by ſuch tremendous conſequences—what friend to Hu-

manity would wiſh to ſee it repeated? The people of France, corrupted as they now are by habits of licentiouſneſs and inſubordination, and inured to every ſpecies of violence and crime, are ſurely much leſs calculated than they were four years ago, for ſo feeble and diſcordant a ſyſtem of Government.

INSTEAD, therefore, of pretending, like DUMOURIER, to find a rallying point in the abſurd and miſchievous reveries of the firſt Legiſlative Aſſembly, or, indeed, any where within the whole compaſs of the Revolution, the real friends of their country will ardently deſire the reſtoration of their ancient Monarchy, as affording the only chance for a return of repoſe, harmony, and ſubjection to the laws. To the ſame object will the wiſhes of every friend to Humanity be directed, for the ſake of that general peace and ſecurity, which, as experience has fulled proved, cannot be regained without the re-eſtabliſhment of order in France.

UNTIL the reſtoration of that Monarchy, it will be in vain to hope for the complete deſtruction of the Revolutionary Power, which menaces and defies the whole world—which endangers the rights of every PROPRIETOR IN EUROPE—which ſeeks the deſtruction of the Government and the Church of every country—

which

which aims at the univerſal diſorganization of ſociety—and which, finally, has kindled a general War; in which ſo many States have been compelled to engage, not merely in defence of their honour, but for the preſervation of their exiſtence.

9 DE 63

# OBJECTIONS

TO THE

# CONTINUANCE

OF THE

# *WAR*

# EXAMINED AND REFUTED.

" If, then, there be any-where a Nation of a reſtleſs and miſchievous " diſpoſition, always ready to injure others, to traverſe their deſigns, and " to raiſe domeſtic troubles; it is not to be doubted that all have a right to " join, in order to repreſs, chaſtiſe, and put it ever after out of its power " to injure them." VATTEL.

PUBLISHED IN OCTOBER,

1793.

BRITISH MUSEUM

## ADVERTISEMENT.

IF, in reaſoning upon the ſubject of the preſent War, we would avoid error, it is neceſſary to keep in conſtant remembrance, that the War itſelf differs ſo eſſentially from all former Wars, as to have little in common with them but the name. In every period of the World, States have been obliged to reſort to hoſtilities, in order to repel Ambition, to reſiſt Injuſtice, to preſerve Religion or Independence. An Enemy of a new kind has riſen up—one who fights not merely to ſubdue States, but to diſſolve Society—not to extend Empire, but to ſubvert Government—not to introduce a particular Religion, but to extirpate all Religion. In the natural impulſe which leads to reſiſtance for the ſake of preſervation, and in the union which ariſes from a ſenſe of common danger, may be found the true principle

ciple of the War, and of the extenſive Alliances by which it is ſuported.

It is perhaps as remarkable as any other circumſtance of the War, that in the various States which are now defending their exiſtence there ſhould be found perſons, who, without being able to plead indigence as an excuſe for deſperation, oppoſe ſo neceſſary a defence, and who contend that it ſhould not have been undertaken; and being undertaken, that it ought to be abandoned. To counteract ſuch aſſertions, and to refute the inſidious reaſonings by which they are ſupported, is the principal deſign of the following Pages.

OBJEC-

# OBJECTIONS, &c.

EVERY friend to humanity muſt anxiouſly deſire the termination of the anarchy of France; and a vaſt majority, both in Parliament and in the Nation at large, look to a vigorous proſecution of the preſent War as the only means of averting the horrors, with which that anarchy menaces the reſt of Europe. There are, notwithſtanding, perſons to be found, who deprecate the ſucceſs of this War, and who endeavour, by every obſtacle they can throw in its way, to impede its progreſs, and to bring it to a raſh and premature concluſion.

THE public mind is inceſſantly addreſſed on this important ſubject, with a variety of artful and ſpecious reaſonings, tending to abate that general and zealous ſupport, by which the War has been eminently diſtinguiſhed, and on the continuance of which its ſucceſs eſſentially depends: and often, without any reaſoning at all, the common-

place

place topics which War, alas! ſo copiouſly ſupplies, are reſorted to, in order to increaſe that reſtleſſneſs, which ſuch a ſituation naturally tends to inſpire. While, however, endeavours are thus uſed to promote an unavailing impatience for the bleſſings of peace, the important queſtion, whether peace is, at preſent, within our reach, is either altogether ſuppreſſed, or uncandidly taken for granted in the affirmative. But who can entertain an idea of preſent pacification, without ſhutting his eyes on the actual ſtate of France? For, laying aſide every feeling of pride, national dignity, and reſentment, will any one ſeriouſly maintain the propoſition, that the preſent rulers of that diſtracted country can give the leaſt ſecurity for the performance of any terms they might agree to? Were they to paſs through the forms of negociation and treaty, it would be only to relieve themſelves from that preſſure which they find it is impoſſible to ſuſtain much longer*.— But the State that ſhould rely either on their

* By the Conſtitution of 1793, the Republic is declared to be *indiviſible*, and it is decreed that no peace ſhall be made with an enemy, who occupies any part of the Territory of the Republic. The neceſſary preliminaries of peace are therefore the ceſſion, not only of Savoy, Nice, but alſo of Auſtrian Flanders, Liege, &c. which ſtill form a part of the nominal Republic, under the title of the Department of Jemappe, and Deputies from which continue to ſit in the Convention.

good

good faith or their ability to keep their engagements, would juſtly become a victim to its temerity. A treaty implies the exiſtence of two ſolid parties, reciprocally bound, poſſeſſing mutual confidence, and able to enforce and guarantee their reſpective ſtipulations. But in the preſent inſtance, the engagement would be wholly on one ſide. There would, in effect, be but one contracting party. The eſtabliſhed Governments of Europe can indeed lawfully and validly engage for their reſpective States; but where is the Government to engage for or to bind France? The lawleſs ruffians who to-day are uppermoſt, may to-morrow be themſelves the victims of a new Revolution—and their ſucceſſors, far from recognizing their acts, may denounce them for having treated with Tyrants, as their greateſt crime—and execute them upon a charge of making peace, as they executed their predeceſſors on a charge of having involved the Republic in a War with England and Holland *. Or, perhaps, to eſcape ſuch a fate, the pre-

* It is a memorable circumſtance, that the Faction which at this moment have the aſcendancy in France, employed as one of the means by which they ſupplanted their predeceſſors, an accuſation that the latter had wantonly and unneceſſarily provoked the war with England and Holland. Can any other proof be neceſſary to ſhew that the War was unavoidable on our part? Or can there be more deciſive evi-

dence

preſent ruling party would make a merit of perfidy, avow that they employed negociation only

dence that the exertions of Great Britain are inexpreſſibly galling to the common enemy? The Briſſotines thought themſelves, with the aid of inſurrection, a match for the whole world.—The Maratiſts find that it would have been better if the former had left them only the Emperor and the King of Pruſſia on their hands; and they would poſſibly be willing to poſtpone our turn, until they can put it out of our power to have ſuch powerful Allies. Feeling the weight of our arm, they would perhaps, for the preſent, prefer our neutrality to our hoſtility; but being plunged in the War upon ſo extenſive a ſcale, by the raſhneſs of thoſe who preceded them in power, they ſtill, at times, indulge themſelves with the hope of accompliſhing their object, difficult as it is become. They enjoy in a moment of ſucceſs the proſpect of humbling the "Commercial, Ariſtocratical, Banking, Royal "City of London;" and of extending their anarchical ſway from the capital of the Spaniſh to that of the Britiſh Empire (ſee the Report of *Barrere* on the recapture of Toulon). Can any one doubt that, in ſuch moments, they prey in imagination upon thoſe Neutral Powers which, by furniſhing them with ſupplies, enable them to maintain their cauſe? Are not the Governments of thoſe States, the preſent friendſhip of which they apparently court, as much the objects of their averſion as thoſe with which they are at war? Has not their emiſſary introduced a Jacobin Club into Genoa, and expreſſed a hope that the people there would ſoon prevail over their Government? Nay, have we not the authority of Waſhington to aſſert, that their Plenipotentiary has endeavoured to excite diſcord, revolt, and anarchy in America? To all regular and eſtabliſhed Government they have an inſeparable averſion;—and they feel as much ſympathy for the *Sans Calottes* of Denmark, Genoa, and America, as for thoſe of Brabant and Germany.

as

as a ſnare (which would, doubtleſs, be the real truth), and renew their hoſtile attacks with additional fury, and with greatly increaſed advantages. In ſhort, while the actual ſtate of France forbids all confidence in its aſſurances or engagements, the ſyſtem which there prevails is incompatible with tranquillity, foreign and domeſtic. War is its only element; the vital principle by which alone it can be fed. Such a ſtate of ſociety cannot be held together by any other tie.—Productive of turbulence and moleſtation from the commencement of the Revolution, all attempts to obtain peace otherwiſe than by the entire deſtruction of this ſyſtem, would tend only to place the acquiſition of that invaluable bleſſing at a ſtill greater diſtance *.

Those perſons who recommend the experiment of negociation are bound to ſhew, that it is the way to attain that ſecurity and repoſe, without

* The Government of this Country has been cenſured for not being ready to treat with every Faction in France the moment its ſucceſsful crimes gave it aſcendancy.—Thoſe who urge ſuch cenſure do not heſitate to avow the principle, that whoever holds the reins of power (however obtained) is proper to be negociated with. If this pliant and accommodating policy had been adopted by Great Britain, ſhe muſt lately have formed a great variety of engagements, from each of which ſhe would have been ſpeedily releaſed—by the downfal of the other *high contracting party*.

which peace would be merely nominal and deluſive. But this is a taſk they do not even undertake. They avoid that inveſtigation which alone could juſtify the adoption of ſo important a meaſure, and they avail themſelves of the palatable nature of the remedy they propoſe, inſtead of examining the manner of its operation, or the effect it is likely to produce. The idea of negociation is grateful and ſoothing to the generous mind—it ſuggeſts abſtractedly a termination of differences, and an eſtabliſhment of harmony;—but as it is a *relative* idea, it ſhould, in its application to a particular caſe, be examined by *relative* and not by *abſtract* qualities. It is *then* the part of wiſdom and prudence to inquire, with whom it is propoſed to negociate; whether they poſſeſs the eſſential requiſites for negociation; whether the objects of negociation be attainable, or (if attainable) deſirable with regard to ſuch perſons; and what, under all ſubſiſting and probable circumſtances, are likely to be the effects of an attempt to negociate. Judging in this manner of the queſtion of negociation at the preſent moment, can it be ſaid that thoſe perſons, with whom alone it is poſſible to negociate, poſſeſs any of the eſſential requiſites for ſuch an intercourſe? Have they either ſtability to enſure, ability to perform, or ſincerity to attract confidence? It is notorious to the whole world, that in all theſe particulars they are totally deficient. They are entirely

entirely deſtitute of all thoſe qualities, moral and political, which muſt exiſt in order to render the objects of negociation attainable. Suppoſing even that they were capable of giving permanence to their engagements, it requires an incredible degree of political apathy to ſay, that an *adjuſtment of differences and an eſtabliſhment of harmony* are *deſirable* with reſpect to ſuch perſons. It is admitted that independent States have no juriſdiction over each other, in reſpect of the moral character of thoſe, who hold the reins of power. But it would be a mournful day for humanity, which ſhould witneſs a general recognition of the authority of a ſet of uſurpers, who are not only, like all uſurpers, ſtained with guilt and crimes, but who have formally adopted vice, cruelty, impiety, and perfidy, as their political ſyſtem; who have diſclaimed every ſanction, which civilized nations have agreed to reſpect: who have renounced every tie and reſtraint which are eſſential to good order, and indeed to the exiſtence of ſociety; and who have publicly abjured the moſt important of all relations, that between man and his Maker—between time and eternity. To ſeek pacification with ſuch a Power would be to court, nay, to embrace deſtruction. Beſides, can it be expedient, in a political ſenſe, for the Monarchs of Europe to treat with thoſe, whoſe aim it is to extirpate

Monarchy*? Shall the Powers who fight to maintain the faith of Treaties, and to enforce the laws of Nations, form ſtipulations with thoſe who deride the authority of both? Theſe ſanguinary uſurpers are fully and juſtly ſenſible that there is no ſafety for them, but in the deſtruction of all regular and eſtabliſhed Governments; they have therefore vowed to accompliſh that deſtruction. And ſurely thoſe Governments ought, on their part, to be alike ſenſible, that there can be no ſecurity for them, nor, of courſe, for their States, until their implacable and inveterate foe be deſtroyed.

To counterbalance theſe diſqualifications in the parties with whom it is propoſed to negociate, we are told, that they have poſſeſſed themſelves of the ſupreme power of their Country —that we, being ſenſible of their power to carry on war, ſhould acknowledge their power to make

* The Monarchs engaged in the War certainly ſhould not forget that (beſides the many menaces which have been thrown out againſt them throughout the Revolution), the National Convention, on the 25th of Auguſt 1792, did actually paſs a decree to raiſe a body of 1200 aſſaſſins, to be named *Tyrannicides*, who were to be bound by an oath to deſtroy the Monarchs and Generals at war with France. This horrid plan was actually decreed, but was afterwards referred to a Committee, on a ſuggeſtion that it might occaſion reprifals.

peace

peace—that the Duke of Brunſwick, General Wurmſer, Lord Hood, having felt their power, and the Prince de Cobourg being likely to feel it, our Government ought to be diſpoſed to recognize it by Treaty *. But without any reference to the means, by which that power was obtained, we need only advert to the manner in which it is employed, and to the principles, which it ſeeks to inculcate by fire and ſword, to be convinced, that, while it exiſts, there can be no ſecurity for the power, independence, or quiet, of any other country. It is, indeed, a curious mode of reaſoning, to contend, that becauſe a Power is able to moleſt and annoy, it is therefore deſerving of truſt and confidence—that becauſe it has ſhewn itſelf malignant and miſchievous, it is capable of becoming benign and beneficent.—Surely there are Powers, with which no terms can be made, which are, in their nature, at conſtant variance with peace and ſecurity, and which can only be prevented from producing deſtruction, by being deſtroyed themſelves. The more formidable ſuch Powers are, the more neceſſary it is to cruſh them. It is dangerous to encounter the rapacious tyger and blood-thirſty wolf: but whoſoever ſhould endeavour to cultivate their friendſhip, inſtead of reſiſting their fury, would pay dearly for his conciliatory diſpoſition.

* Theſe and the following topics in favour of negociation, have been urged by Mr. Fox, and the other members of Oppoſition.

It is further contended, in favour of the experiment of negociation, that though it ſhould fail, it would ſtill be attended with the advantage of demonſtrating that the war is altogether neceſſary, unavoidable, and defenſive; and that it would even tend to diminiſh the enthuſiaſm of the People in France, by ſhowing them, that they are engaged in a war, not of defence, but of conqueſt. It is ſomewhat remarkable, that the ſame perſons who urge this reaſoning declare, almoſt in the ſame breath, that whether the original aggreſſion proceeded from us or the French, has ceaſed to be a queſtion of importance, and that the origin of the war is become only a ſecondary conſideration. But in order to aſcertain the real nature and principle of the War, is it not abundantly more ſafe and eaſy to remount to its origin and cauſes, than to reſort to the doubtful and precarious experiment of negociation? They who, after conſidering the inſulting and aggreſſive conduct of France—her declared intentions of ſubverting every Government in Europe—her direct communication with diſaffected Engliſh ſubjects, for the ſubverſion of our own Government and Conſtitution—her renunciation of the authority of the laws of Nations—her wanton attack upon the Ally, to whom we were bound by the moſt ſolemn Treaties, and whoſe ſecurity was eſſential to our own—and, finally, her hoſtile and perfidious attack upon ourſelves, becauſe ſhe could not

bully us into an acquieſcence in ſuch a conduct—they who want *further* demonſtration that the war is neceſſary, unavoidable, and defenſive, are of that ſceptical diſpoſition, which affords no chance of bringing conviction to their minds, either by negociation or any other means. —They who are not completely ſatisfied by a review of the above circumſtances, would "not "be perſuaded though one roſe from the dead." The ingenuity of ſuch perſons would probably come in aid of their incredulity, and aſſiſt them to diſcover, that a failure of negociation was owing to the manner in which it was conducted, to the haughtineſs by which it was accompanied, and ſome might find out that *it was never meant to ſucceed.*

But in the vain and fruitleſs attempt to convince ſome minds, there is danger that others, which are now firm in their belief, and ardent in their zeal, might be ſhaken. The original grounds of the war do not require to be ſtrengthened—they cannot be changed to advantage—and nothing can conduce more, to a general and animated ſupport of the war, than to keep them in conſtant view. But an attempt to negociate would have the appearance of abandoning thoſe grounds; and the very perſons who propoſe negociation, would be the firſt to give it that conſtruction. The very reaſoning, by which they ſupport that propoſal, proves that they would be

ready to ſay, " You ſought further proof that " the war was defenſive and unavoidable, and " thereby you admitted that ſuch proof was " before deficient."

An attempt to negociate would alſo involve a dereliction of the principle of the war, from which we have declared it impoſſible ever to depart, and would put it out of our power, with conſiſtency, to reſume that principle. It would imply, that the object of the war is not conſidered to be indiſpenſable. That object certainly is not *yet* attained; and our ſucceſſes, however important, can only be conſidered as ſteps towards its attainment. Thoſe ſucceſſes have, indeed, repelled immediate danger (an object certainly of the firſt conſequence), but they muſt be followed up, in order to provide for future ſecurity, on which the value of the advantages, already acquired, intirely depends. But no ſucceſſes, in a war like the preſent, can warrant us to expect the attainment of ſuch an object, by way of negociation, while the perſons with whom we contend retain their aſcendancy in France. For the ſyſtem adopted by thoſe perſons, is as eſſential to their political exiſtence, as it is hoſtile to our ſecurity, and to that of the reſt of Europe. It would be the mereſt farce to aſk them to concede ſuch a ſyſtem. Our mutual objects are, reſpectively, as

as indiſpenſable in themſelves, as they are incompatible with each other. If the difference between us and France were merely a queſtion of honour, ariſing out of the inſults and provocations we have received, what would become of our dignity, if after being forced into a war, becauſe we would not ſubmit to thoſe inſults and provocations, we were to ſeek ſatisfaction otherwiſe than at the point of the ſword, and, with our wrongs ſtill unredreſſed, to tender the olive branch to our perfidious foe?—And ſurely the policy of ſuing for peace is not heightened by the circumſtance, that our ſecurity is *immediately* and *diſtinctly* concerned, independently of its inſeparable connection with our honour. The offer of negociation, abject and humiliating as it would be, with reſpect to ourſelves, would alſo tend to inſpire our Allies with a diſtruſt both in our exertions and our profeſſions. They would naturally ſuſpect that, inſtead of being determined on a vigorous proſecution of the War, we were ſeeking for an opportunity of receding from the conteſt; and thus that mutual confidence, which is the ſoul of co-operation, would be diſſolved.

The idea that a propoſal to negociate would *abate the enthuſiaſm of the French people for the War, by convincing them that it would, if afterwards perſiſted in, be on their part a War not of defence but of conqueſt*, could ſcarcely be

meant to be ſerious. Such an obſervation could only be intended to relieve the gravity of ſerious diſcuſſion, by ſurprizing the mind with a ſtriking aſſemblage of images, which it required a wonderful talent to aſſociate in one point of view. But, certainly, we could not better aſſiſt the rulers of France, in keeping up whatever *enthuſiaſm* prevails among the French people, in favour of the war, than by an offer of accommodation.—And thoſe rulers would be deſtitute of their uſual ability, if they neglected ſuch an opportunity of inſpiring the partiſans of their infamous ſyſtem with additional confidence and fury, and of filling the minds of their opponents with diſmay. The motive of defence would be a weak ſtimulative to *anarchical enthuſiaſm*, compared to the proſpect of univerſal conqueſt and boundleſs deſtruction *.

But

* The probable effect of a propoſal to negociate is not now left to conjecture; for although we have not diſgraced ourſelves by making ſuch an offer, the caſe has actually occurred in the frenetic imaginations of the Convention, and the manner in which the wild ſuppoſition was treated, leaves no room to doubt of the impreſſion which the reality would produce. Barrere, in the month of Feb. 1794, in the name of the Committee of Public Welfare, announced to the Convention that the Confederate Powers had ſued for peace. In the courſe of his furious rhodomontade on this occaſion, are found the following choice paſſages: "You "deſire peace—the leagued Kings do the ſame, but mark at "what

But ſome of the opponents of the War take another ground, and, affecting the utmoſt deteſtation of the monſters who tyrannize over France, diſclaim all idea of alliance, accommodation, or even communication, with ſuch wretches. They content themſelves with propoſing to *abandon* the War, to withdraw our forces, to remain on the defenſive, and to leave France to herſelf. Such a propoſal, if addreſſed ſingly to Great Britain, involves a greater inſult on common ſenſe, and a groſſer violation of ſound policy, than even that of negociation. Shall we calmly look on, as indifferent ſpectators, while a Power, which is acknowledged to be unfit for alliance or amity with any civilized State, is eſtabliſhing and extending its dominion, and acquiring a degree of ſtrength, which we may hereafter find irreſiſtible? To do this in any caſe would be egregious folly: but to do it after the

" what price! A Diplomatic Agent in a Neutral State ſaid " the other day, *The Confederate Powers are willing proviſion-* " *ally to acknowledge the French Republic* (burſt of laughter). " Well, *let us proviſionally deſtroy all tyrannical Governments.*" (applauſes)—And again: " The Tyrants offer you peace, be- " cauſe they have neither money nor ſoldiers."—And again: " IF THE BRITISH PEOPLE WISH FOR PEACE, WHY DO THEY " NOT DETACH THEMSELVES FROM THEIR INFERNAL GO- " VERNMENT?"—Finally, " Arms and Gunpowder muſt " alone procure peace."

expe-

experience we have had of the evils inſeparable from the exiſtence of ſuch a Power, would be a degree of folly, for which it would be impoſſible to find an adequate name. Nor could this Country inflict a deeper wound on her honour, nor more effectually ſacrifice that reputation for good faith, and punctual adherence to her engagements, by which ſhe is ſo eminently diſtinguiſhed, than by abandoning the connection which ſhe has formed with other States, for their common ſecurity. Could ſhe, after ſuch a conduct, hope for aſſiſtance in a moment of diſtreſs, even if any State ſhould continue able to aſſiſt her? or, Could ſhe expect, as heretofore, to ſupply the want of external aſſiſtance, by the aid of internal fortitude and energy, when each of her legitimate ſons would bluſh at the name of Briton? We have witneſſed, indeed, the ſhocking ſpectacle of a people becoming alike dreadful and deteſtable, by the debaſement of character, and the extinction of moral ſentiment;—but the natives of this renowned Iſle, invincible as they have often proved themſelves, would loſe their ſpirit with their dignity—they would endeavour to hide their bluſhing faces, if they could not look elate with conſcious rectitude and unſullied honour. It is therefore to be hoped that no Engliſhman can inſult his country ſo far as to propoſe, that we ſhould violate our plighted faith—

and, relying on that Element, which has been ſo often the ſcene of our glory, to protect us in our diſgrace, that we ſhould, in defiance of our engagements, leave France and our Allies to their reſpective fates.

The propoſal, therefore, of diſcontinuing the War, without the diſgraceful recognition of Jacobin authority, muſt be meant to refer to the *combined Powers* collectively. But were they to adopt the project of leaving *France* alone, could they indulge the hope that France would do the ſame by *them?*—What but War have they to oppoſe to her fraternizing incurſions? If, with the advantage of union and concert, they find it ſo difficult to obtain a barrier againſt thoſe incurſions, how could they protect their reſpective States, when their force ſhould be divided? What could they expect but to be over-run, one after another, by the combined efforts of French principles and French arms, invigorated by ſucceſs, and aſſiſted by the *congenial ſpirits* of their own Dominions? The union which reigns among them being once broken, would probably be broken for ever.—Or if they ſhould find it poſſible to rally, they could not expect to regain the poſition in which they now ſtand. They would loſe the fruit of all their exertions; and with their confidence, energy, and means of ſucceſs diminiſhed, in proportion as thoſe of the enemy would be increaſed, they would

would have to begin again their already arduous taſk—*de novo*.

To render the inſidious propoſal of abandoning the War more feaſible, it is urged, that the overthrow of the Jacobin ſyſtem in France would be certain, if the Nation were left to itſelf, and relieved from the preſſure of invaſion. But raſh indeed would be the Stateſman, who ſhould deſiſt from endeavouring to accelerate the deſtruction of this baneful ſyſtem, in the confidence that it would *quietly* expire of itſelf. It certainly is not calculated for duration; but what miſchief may it not accompliſh before the period of its natural diſſolution ſhall arrive? It is not even pretended that, while it continues, there is any ground to expect that its nature will change. The very hypotheſis now combated, ſuppoſes its termination to be neceſſary for the tranquillity of mankind. The Jacobin diſturbers of that tranquillity are not very likely to be metamorphoſed into peaceable and unoffending neighbours. They are to this moment as rancorous and as meddling as ever.*

The

* Among the numerous, though, by no means the firſt, proofs, of the meddling diſpoſition and views of the French Revolutioniſts, it ſhould not be forgotten, that in the month of June, 1790, the National Aſſembly received, with univerſal applauſe, a diſaffected Pruſſian, named Anacharſis Cloots, who, at the head of a motley group, pretending to be deputies from all the Countries in the world, and dreſſed in character, delivered at the Bar of the Aſſembly a Petition,

in

The nature of Anarchy is indeed immutable. It can never ceaſe, while it exiſts, to be reſtleſs, turbu-

the name of *the whole human race*; ſtating *that the Trumpet, which had ſounded the Reſurrection of a great Nation, had reſounded to the four corners of the Earth, and awakened the Nations, long buried in ſlavery—that the people, who were every where under the yoke of Dictators, who called themſelves Sovereigns*, in defiance of French principles, *would take comfort to learn, from the petitioners, that the firſt Nation in Europe* was aſſembling *its ſtandards, and had* given the ſignal *of happineſs to both worlds*. It would, indeed, be endleſs to enumerate all the proofs which, in conformity to the Decree of Fraternity, evince the diſpoſition of the agents of the French Revolution, and the tendency of the Revolution itſelf, to diſturb and moleſt all the Countries in the world. But, in juſtice to the ſubject, two or three choice ſpecimens ought to be given.

Condorcet, who was ſo kind as to provide for this Country all the advantages of Parliamentary Reform, in their fulleſt poſſible extent, *the complete eſtabliſhment of a Republic*—in Nov. 1792, publiſhed the following paſſage in his Journal—" No Lords! no upper Houſe! no King!" ſuch is the cry of the Engliſh people in London, and in the ſtreets of the other towns of England. Such is the cry that reſounds in the mountains of Scotland, and in the plains of Ireland. Puritans and catholics appear to have the ſame political dogmas. There are none but the King, with perhaps a few old honeſt Lords, or knaviſh courtiers, who profeſs another religion. The Parliament is prorogued to next January. But January will come, and George III. muſt ſoon reſign himſelf to make a new treaty with England, who ſurely will give him a good penſion, if he reſigns himſelf prudently to an inevitable revolution.

Camille des Moulins, an eminent patriot, in his hiſtory of the Briſſotins, acknowledges that " to diſorganize Europe, per-

turbulent, and encroaching. Its neighbourhood is contagious, its atmoſphere peſtilential, its fraternity deſtructive.

But the ſuppoſition that the actual preſſure of foreign invaſion is neceſſary for the maintenance of

haps to purge it of its Tyrants, was the *ſublime vocation of the Convention.*" Briſſot, who was in great power at the declaration of the War againſt England, and who was afterwards tried for having involved France in that War, does not ſcruple to make the following honeſt declaration: "We must set fire to the four corners of Europe." But let us pay a viſit to the Jacobins, who have governed France at leaſt ever ſince the year 1792. At a ſitting of this *buſy* fraternity, in January 1794, *Cambon* ſaid, "Let us judge with impar-"tiality the principles on which the Britiſh Government "reſts. I ſee a King! Good God, a King! What a mon-"ſter in nature! A King, who by the very Statutes is en-"truſted with ſuch a plenitude of power as muſt devour, and "indeed does devour, all the little powers which Popular "Credulity flatters itſelf ſtill to be inveſted with."

In the ſame ſitting *Couthon* moved that the Jacobins ſhould celebrate the memorable epoch of the death of the Tyrant, by unanimouſly and ſolemnly repeating their oaths, *that they would deſtroy all Tyrants.*—This oath was immediately taken. Several motions were afterwards made concerning the means of executing this purpoſe, of which the following were a part: "That all Kings are to be beheaded in effigy; and on "every Theatre ſhall be preſented the *laſt Judgment of Kings* "(one of the favourite Republican dramas). It was alſo re-"ſolved to congratulate *The Mountain* on account of the "energy diſplayed in the trial of the Tyrant, and to order "a *feu de joye* to be fired the very hour when the Tyrant "died."

ſuch

ſuch a ſyſtem, is contradicted both by reaſon and experience. We have had abundant proof that it can be nouriſhed, as effectually, by a ſpirit of aggreſſion, ambition, vengeance, and proſelytiſm, as by the more domeſtic impulſe of national defence. We have ſeen that, when relieved from the preſſure of invaſion, the principle of that ſyſtem is of a wonderfully expanſive nature. We have ſeen that it is capable of ſpreading, with irreſiſtible velocity, from State to State, and that, under the ſpecious pretence of beſtowing Univerſal Liberty, it is ſuſceptible of the bold project of ſubjecting every Country under heaven to the yoke of France. We have alſo ſeen, that far from being weakened by expanſion, it becomes, like all *contagious* ſyſtems, more formidable and deſtructive every ſtep it advances, "*Mobilitate viget, "virefque acquirit eundo.*" If the ſcheme therefore of invading France were relinquiſhed, it muſt ſpeedily be reſumed, as the only effectual means of preſerving other Countries from invaſion; and thus the caſe would ſpeedily recur, which is admitted to be favourable to Jacobiniſm. One event only could prevent ſuch a recurrence—the entire reduction of all force capable of reſiſting that of France.

It has been already obſerved, that War is neceſſary to the continuance of the ſyſtem which has juſtly excited univerſal alarm; for War alone

can

can afford occaſion for that joint influence of terror and mad enthuſiaſm, which is neceſſary to hold ſo diſcordant a maſs together. But this conſideration, far from warranting the concluſion which is deduced from it, affords, perhaps, the ſtrongeſt reaſon that can be aſſigned, for the vigorous purſuit of the War, until its ultimate object be completely and ſecurely attained. For if the ſyſtem of our opponents cannot exiſt but by the aid of War, it follows of courſe that they are under the neceſſity of continuing hoſtilities, for the preſervation of that ſyſtem. This they will find as eaſy as it is neceſſary, ſince they command the force and the paſſions of their Country. The fallacy of the contrary ſuppoſition conſiſts in confounding offenſive with defenſive War, and in concluding that the Powers of Europe could avoid the neceſſity of the one, with the ſame facility as they can form the raſh reſolution to abandon the other; as if they were in poſſeſſion of ſome magical ſpell to reſtrain the Furies of France, (when unchained by the retreat of the armies, which now keep them in check, and impatient to revenge the hardſhips they have been made to ſuffer,) from again traverſing their Frontier, in order to carry their Liberty, Equality, and deſolating Fraternity to other regions. In a conteſt like the preſent, the ſword is the only ſhield. There is no other alternative for the Combined Powers than *offenſive* or

*defen-*

*defenſive* War. Aſſaulted in the firſt inſtance themſelves, they were obliged, for the preſervation of their States, to convert defence into attack. If they had not done ſo, they would, in all probability, by this time have had no States to defend. But the tranſition may not be again poſſible; and it only remains for them to perſevere in the attack, with a degree of vigour proportioned to the importance of its object, until they may ſecurely turn their ſwords into plough-ſhares; and, in the ſolid eſtabliſhment of *genuine* peace, find a ſolace and a remedy for the miſeries of war.

In purſuit of the inſidious attempt to excite a diſſatisfaction with the War, and to render it unpopular, nothing which is capable of perverſion and miſapplication is ſuffered to eſcape notice. The diſtreſſes and dangers which are inſeparable from a ſtate of hoſtility are painted in the moſt glowing colours:—the ever-lively apprehenſions of the Merchant and the Manufacturer are pathetically addreſſed, and the moſt alarming ſcenes are diſplayed to their ſuſceptible minds. Beſides the inconveniences which may fairly be aſcribed to the War, it is alſo charged with embarraſſments produced by other cauſes. Incredible pains are taken to make it appear reſponſible for every misfortune which occurs, and the melancholy liſt of Bankruptcies, with which for

ſome time our Gazettes were clouded, is, without heſitation, placed to that account. But the recovery of credit, *flagrante bello*, affords the beſt anſwer to ſuch inſinuations. The Gazettes, which happily no longer afford even this apparent ground of triumph, vindicate the War from the aſperſion, and demonſtrate that the late commercial failures aroſe from a very different ſource*.

Of

* It is a pleaſing circumſtance to be able to aſcertain, that the late unparalleled diſtreſs of the Commercial and Manufacturing World, inſtead of being occaſioned by the War, may be traced, with certainty, to the rapid progreſs and wonderful extent of the proſperity of the country. The War, far from having drained our reſources, was but juſt begun. No viſible ſtagnation had taken place in trade or manufactures, until the very moment when they received the ſudden ſhock. The operation of war would have been gradual, and thereby have furniſhed opportunities to counteract or leſſen the miſchief. The ſudden tranſition of the Country from alarm and diſtreſs to wealth, confidence, and proſperity, had encouraged individuals to ſeize, if not with too much avidity, at leaſt with too little precaution, the golden occaſion. Trade was puſhed to the utmoſt extent. The boldneſs of ſpeculation and adventure knew no bounds. All this, however, would have been warranted by the ſtate of the Country, if adequate and ſecure channels had been provided for that circulating medium, which, (like the blood in the animal frame) muſt inceſſantly feed and ſupport the operations of commerce. But, inſtead thereof, the channels that were opened and depended upon for this important purpoſe, were remarkably precarious, unſtable, and unfit to reſiſt any extraordinary preſſure. The manufacturer boldly laid out his returns in new capital, in raw materials, in buildings and ma-

Of all claſſes of perſons, the Commercial has the leaſt reaſon to indulge reſtleſſneſs and impatience

machinery, while he depended on the aſſiſtance of paper currency to anſwer both conſtant demands and occaſional exigencies. That paper currency (which was iſſued to ſuch an extent as almoſt to make both ſpecie and Bank of England ſecurity diſappear, in many parts of the country) was deſtitute of any ſolid foundation. The perſons who iſſued it were in general, far from being qualified by their capitals ſo to do. They ſet up Country Banks for the purpoſe of ſpeculating; and they diſtributed their paper, to the utmoſt poſſible extent, upon the ſecurity of mortgages, of various ſpeculations, and even of *thoſe very manufactures*, which depended for their ſupport, on the ſtability of ſuch paper. The ſupply of ready caſh kept within reach, was barely ſufficient for common occaſions; and the funds, which ſhould have been ready to anſwer a ſudden or an unuſual call, were either not in exiſtence, or not within reach. Nothing can be more evident than that the fabric which reſted on ſuch a baſis muſt, ſooner or later, fall to the ground. The fictitious credit, which was its ſupport, muſt, in the ordinary courſe of events, be put to the teſt, and the weight of the maſs, every day increaſing, muſt at length, of itſelf, make ſo weak a foundation give way. It has not been proved that the War accelerated the cataſtrophe, which in itſelf was unavoidable. If it did, it was ſo far ſerviceable, by rendering that cataſtrophe leſs ſhocking and diſaſtrous than it muſt have been if longer delayed. A few failures (unconnected with the War) happened, in effect, to prove the Touchſtone of that artificial credit, with which ſo large a portion of our Trade and Manufactures was inſeparably interwoven. The effect was almoſt inſtantaneous. Diſtruſt, thus excited, and meeting with ſuch ſolid grounds, ſpread with inconceivable velocity to every part

patience under the War; for although that claſs may ſuſtain a larger ſhare, than any other, of the temporary inconvenience inſeparable from ſuch a ſtate, it is beyond all compariſon the moſt

of the Commercial ſyſtem. Bankruptcies ſo numerous, ſo extenſive, ſo contrary to all expectation, took place, that no one knew in whom to confide. Numbers were involved in the diſaſter, who, far from being implicated in the cauſe, were men of undeniable property and unimpeachable credit, but who could not at the moment avail themſelves of thoſe advantages. Every day brought freſh misfortunes; and, in the total failure of confidence, the poſſible extent of the evil defied all conjecture. The Bank, finding the miſchief beyond its ability to remedy, was, in prudence, obliged to with-hold an ineffectual relief. At the critical moment Government ſeaſonably and effectually interpoſed. The Miniſter ſuggeſted a meaſure, which received the ſanction of Parliament, for the ſupport of ſinking Credit. Five millions of Exchequer Bills were iſſued for that purpoſe, and Commiſſioners were appointed, without a ſalary, to deliver them on good ſecurity to Traders who wanted ſuch aſſiſtance. The meaſure has met a ſucceſs equal to the moſt benevolent wiſh, and beyond the moſt ſanguine expectation. About two millions of the Exchequer Bills have been found ſufficient to anſwer the purpoſe, and perſons of ſolid property, enabled thereby to ſuſtain the preſſure of the moment, have had time to avail themſelves of their actual reſources. Confidence has thus, during the progreſs of the War, been reſtored to the Commercial World; Credit has paſſed the furnace, and has been purified.—The ſound part of the ſyſtem has been preſerved; the *ſtamina* have been aſcertained to be unimpaired; and notwithſtanding the effect of ſuch a convulſion, unprecedented in the annals of Trade, the Revenue has, during the firſt year of a War, equalled the average of the four laſt years of Peace!

benefited

benefited by the *preſent* ſecurity which the War has already produced; and it will derive the moſt extenſive advantage from that *permanent* ſecurity, which it is the object of the War to eſtabliſh. Of all the branches of the ſocial ſyſtem, the Commercial is by far the moſt ſenſitive—that which is the ſooneſt affected by a diſturbed atmoſphere, and which flouriſhes, with the greateſt luxuriance, under the benign influence of a ſerene and ſettled ſky. They who are fond of tracing a picture of ſuffering Commerce, and who, in their zeal to make the War appear odious, overcharge that picture greatly beyond the reality, are extremely cautious to conceal another picture, which, by furniſhing a ſtriking contraſt, would make an excellent companion to the former one: I mean a picture of the ſtate, in which Commerce would, probably, have been at this time, if it had not been protected by the War, from the deſolating incurſions of the new Republic. Such a picture wants no aſſiſtance from imagination; it may be ſeen in a retroſpect of the deplorable ſituation of ſome of the moſt Commercial Towns of Germany, and of the Provinces of the Auſtrian Netherlands, before the efforts of the War, by reſcuing thoſe Towns and Provinces, ſnatched the reſt of Europe from the impending ravages of French fraternity. But without referring to ſcenes, which happily exiſt no more, the actual condition of France diſplays a faithful repreſentation of the effects of

anarchy upon the commercial, as well as all the other intereſts of a country. Let the Britiſh Merchant conſider what he now is, even during the War, and then let him turn his eyes to France, and to thoſe States which remain ſubject to her barbarous yoke, and there ſee what he might have been, if the baneful and encroaching ſyſtem of Jacobiniſm had not been checked—what he may ſtill be, if that ſyſtem be not exterminated. Let the Manufacturer conſider ſeriouſly, whether it be not better that *ſome* of his looms ſhould afford, for a time, a quiet receptacle to the ſpider, than that they ſhould *all* be at the mercy of a furious rabble, ſpreading deſolation in ſupport of the cauſe of Liberty and Equality? We are told of the thouſands of artiſans who, for want of other employ, are obliged to engage in military ſervice. But as a great proportion (at leaſt) of theſe valuable hands would have been interrupted in their occupation, by circumſtances independent of the War (as has been already noticed), the War is ſo far of advantage, as it furniſhes them with an honourable reſource: and ſince they are prevented, for a time, from throwing the ſhuttle, they cannot, ſurely, be better employed, than in wielding the ſword, in defence of that property, and that ſecurity, on the preſervation of which they depend, for the future renewal of their uſeful labours. Indeed, if all the hardſhips and inconveniences aſcribed to the War

had been produced in the full extent of party exaggeration, they would be ſupported with the utmoſt cheerfulneſs by all, who ſhould view them in competition with the dangers, which the War has already repelled, and with the miſchiefs, which it endeavours to avert. But what a bright and captivating proſpect will open upon us, when, by dint of patient, vigorous, and unremitting exertions, we ſhall have enſured the important and indiſpenſable object of the War? A proſpect in which the Trading Intereſt will appear with diſtinguiſhed luſtre. Brilliant, beyond all experience, will then be the ſituation of this Country: ſecure of all the benefits which its incomparable Conſtitution, its natural and acquired advantages, and its increaſed weight in the political balance can beſtow; the Emporium of Commerce—the Arbiter of Europe—the object of univerſal reſpect and confidence—the pride of Nations—the tutelary Guardian of Society—then will the ſun of Britain's glory ſhine forth with meridian ſplendour *. Nor will it conſtitute a feeble

* It was little thought, when this picture was drawn, that it could be realized *during* the War. But how ſtriking a deſcription does it afford of our preſent ſituation! How juſt a diſplay does it make of thoſe advantages, both foreign and domeſtic, which have already been derived from *that* War, which a factious Oppoſition have conſtantly repreſented as diſaſtrous in the extreme, and which they have been inceſ-

feeble ray of that glory to have been inſtrumental in reſtoring to a neighbouring, and, for ages, a rival Country, the bleſſings of order and legitimate government, and in delivering its ſurviving millions from the fangs of anarchy. The only way to this ſummit of proſperity lies through the rugged path of War, which, however arduous, we muſt with patience and reſolution continue to purſue, or, by abandoning it, we muſt fall into that dreadful abyſs, which elſewhere ſurrounds us on every ſide.

Such are the advantages obtained by the paſt exertions—ſuch the proſpects awaiting the future ſucceſs of a War, which ſome endeavour to repreſent as productive of miſery, and as pregnant with ruin. If, to avoid a War which has produced, and which promiſes ſo much, we had ſubmitted to the inſults of France, there is no room to doubt that our Allies would have been long ſince overwhelmed—the greateſt part of Europe over-run—its balance entirely deſtroyed—its Governments overthrown—and its States broken up and converted into French Departments. Theſe events are neither ſuggeſted

ſantly urging us to terminate, by conceſſions and ſacrifices. We ſpurned at this puſillanimous advice; and Great Britain now ſhines with unparalleled and unprecedented luſtre, and the name of an Engliſhman is a title to univerſal approbation and applauſe!—*Note to the Collection.*

by

by timidity, nor feigned by imagination.—— Realized, in ſome meaſure, before we were engaged in hoſtilities, their completion was advancing with haſty ſtrides, and ſeemed to preſage a deſtruction, which could never have been effected by French arms, if they had not been dipped in the ſubtle poiſon of French principles. Let the opponents of the War point out by what means we ſhould have eſcaped the general wreck. Let them tell us how we ſhould have been preſerved, amidſt ſurrounding ruin. They avow, indeed, an attachment to the Britiſh Conſtitution: they would not have ſcrupled, however, to expoſe this valuable object of their *regard* and *admiration* to the above perils. Happily its preſervation was not entruſted to them. Such friendſhip as theirs would furniſh but a precarious dependence in a moment of danger:

*Non tali auxilio—nec defenſoribus iſtis*
*Tempus eget*————

It is curious to obſerve how very partial and ſcanty a ſurvey is taken of the War, by thoſe who ſeek to make it a ſource of popular diſcontent. They ſee nothing of its numerous and aggravated provocations——of the inſults and dangers by which it was preceded—of the advantages which accompany its progreſs—nor of the important and indiſpenſable objects which depend upon its

its final ſucceſs. All theſe things entirely eſcape their notice: they can only diſcover its perils, its difficulties, its ſcenes of calamity and diſtreſs. Should a check or diſaſter occur, their grief is clamorous, and their indignation knows no bounds. In the vehemence of their concern, they magnify the misfortune vaſtly beyond its real extent, and its probable conſequences.—They make no allowance for accident or difficulty. They find it ſufficient matter for blame that caſualties were not prevented, that impoſſibilities were not performed, that the elements were not compelled to lend their aſſiſtance. Nay, ſo violently are they affected, that although the very next day the misfortune ſhould be not only remedied, but alſo ſkilfully improved to advantage, they cannot ſo ſoon recover their wonted ſerenity. Some, indeed, want the decency even to aſſume a maſk of ſorrow on ſuch occaſions, and are ſo dead to all ſenſe of ſhame as well as of patriotiſm, as openly to exult and triumph in the misfortunes of their country.

Alas! we know already, without their aſſiſtance, that War is unavoidably attended with much danger, difficulty, and inconvenience; that it is a nauſeous, as well as a violent remedy: but it is a remedy which is become neceſſary for our own preſervation, as well as for the reſtoration of general ſecurity againſt the enemies of religion,

gion, morality, order, and civil ſociety. Whoever attempts to oppoſe the purſuit, or to impede the ſucceſs of ſuch a War, is, in effect, a confederate with the monſters againſt whom it is carried on.

But he muſt entertain a very contemptible and injurious opinion of the people of this country, who ſuppoſes that any artifice, miſrepreſentation, or ſophiſtry, can abate their ardour in a ſtruggle, upon the ſucceſs of which, the preſervation of every thing dear to them depends. We know the value of the intereſts we have at ſtake, and ſhall grudge neither exertion nor expence to ſecure them:—We ſhall neither repine at our burdens, ſhould they be neceſſarily augmented, nor deſpond upon thoſe occaſional diſaſters, to which a ſtate of hoſtilities is expoſed. Our gracious Sovereign does not heſitate to expoſe the lives of his ſons in the cauſe of his people; while theſe illuſtrious princes, with a courage truly heroical, face the greateſt dangers, and in defending the cauſe, add to the laurels of their Country. Who ſhall be inſenſible of the influence of ſo bright an example? Where ſhall be found the Engliſhman ſo degenerate as to be backward to aſſiſt, with chearful patriotiſm, in his perſon or in his ſubſtance, the ſame glorious cauſe? Every claſs —every rank is deeply intereſted; for it is the welfare of all which has been endangered, and which

which is to be ſecured. The Peer, and the Peaſant—the Merchant, and the Manufacturer—all perſons, of every deſcription, are concerned to ſupport, to the utmoſt of their power, a conteſt with the common enemy of mankind *. Vain will be all attempts to excite a pre-

* The French Revolution began by attacking the Monarch, the Nobles, and the Clergy; and thoſe neceſſary ranks were called upon, throughout Europe, to view the example with jealouſy and alarm. But the danger was by no means peculiar to them. When the rights of the higher orders are made the ſport of popular fury and outrage, the ſecurity of other claſſes has but a precarious and ſhort-lived exiſtence. The progreſs of the Revolution completely verifies this remark. We now ſee property of every ſpecies, public and private, pillaged with as little ceremony as that of the Church and the Nobility. The principle of univerſal plunder, which was a little while ſince only in embryo, is now arrived at full maturity, and publicly avowed, without a bluſh, in the Convention—where Danton has declared that the people muſt be excited to vengeance againſt the Rich—where the ſame blood-thirſty demagogue has denounced the "Ariſtocracy of Trade" as a proper ſubject of depredation; and one of his infamous colleagues has avowed it to be neceſſary "to convince the *Merchants* that France could do without them." Public bodies are not more ſecure than individuals, and the property of the Eaſt India Company and of the Caiſſe d'Eſcompte is confiſcated upon the moſt abſurd pretences.—Nay, even agricultural property is invaded like the reſt; the whole produce of a harveſt is decreed to belong to the Nation—that is, to thoſe who tyrannize over the Nation; and Roberſpierre, another Conventional Monſter, has declared that the rich farmers muſt be delivered up to the people. While ſuch a ſyſtem

prejudice againſt ſuch a War, unleſs it can be ſubjected to the charge of being carried on with languor and ſupineneſs; a charge which thoſe, who are moſt diſpoſed to cavil, do not attempt to advance. While its character is ſpirit and activity, a diſcerning people, conſcious of the juſtice of their cauſe, will deſpiſe all attempts to make it odious in their eyes. Nor will they be prevented by any artifice from duly appreciating thoſe exertions, both naval and military, which exceed not only all expectation, but alſo all precedent, in any one year of any War: exertions, which have diſplayed themſelves in the rapid extenſion of our marine—in the unconteſted dominion of the Britiſh Flag—in the effectual protection of our own commerce, and the total deſtruction of that of the enemy—in the acquiſitions already made in both the Indies, and the ability we have acquired, to puſh thoſe acquiſitions to any extent we pleaſe—in the permanent and invaluable advantage of having, already, deſtroyed one third of the navy, together with the grand arſenal—not merely of our preſent adverſary, but of our natural rival—in the appropriation of the whole of

a ſyſtem continues to prevail in any country, every trader, farmer, and proprietor, in other countries, ought to tremble. To him who wiſhes the War to be abandoned before ſuch a ſyſtem is exterminated, it may be ſaid with peculiar propriety, "*tua res agitur, de te fabula narratur.*"

the

the Newfoundland fiſhery, of the Levant and the Italian trades—and in the powerful and extenſive Confederacy we have been inſtrumental in forming, among the principal Powers of Europe, to defend the common intereſts of States, the authority of Treaties, the independence of Nations, and the exiſtence of Civilized Society.

THE diſingenuous reaſoners above alluded to aſk, with great ſerioufneſs, whether the war is to be a war of extermination; and they urge that the united force of a country like France, poſſeſſing ſuch immenſe reſources, and ſtruggling for its liberties, preſents a degree of reſiſtance, that muſt baffle all the exertions of the Combined Powers. The war is certainly a war of extermination; but not in the ſenſe its opponents would have us affix to the word. Not a war for the extermination of a people or their liberties: not for the extermination of national proſperity or of ſocial happineſs. Its objects are to root out a tremendous evil, which oppreſſes and ruins a populous and extenſive Territory, and which menaces the whole human race with deſtruction—to deſtroy a ſyſtem of licentiouſneſs, diſorganization, and univerſal hoſtility—and to ſtifle the turbulent ſpirit, and to cruſh the uſurped and ferocious power, by which that ſyſtem is animated and ſuſtained. Theſe are the things which muſt be exterminated

before

before Europe can obtain ſecurity, or enjoy repoſe. The Anarchy of France is a deſolating fire, which ſeeks to conſume whatever is near it. That fire had begun to catch the neighbouring edifices, and, at one period, it menaced all Europe with a general conflagration. By dint of exertion, its progreſs has, happily, been checked, and it has been driven back to the ſpot where it firſt broke out; but what folly would it be to leave it before it is entirely got under! The engines muſt continue to play, until this fire be extinguiſhed, or the flames will again burſt forth, and re-commence their dreadful ravages.

As to the union and reſources which, it is pretended, preſent ſuch obſtacles to the ſucceſs of the War, where is that union? what is the ſtate of thoſe reſources? What union is there in France, but that of unprincipled wretches, who combine, without either attachment or confidence, for the perpetration of crimes, and who ſeek to deſtroy each other, the moment their intereſts or views are divided? The firſt Revolution diſſolved all union and harmony, by ſetting at variance the different ranks in the State, and by removing all thoſe ties and reſtraints, which are neceſſary to connect men in Society. The ſubſequent Revolutions, which have torn and diſtracted France, have been nothing elſe than the ſucceſſive victories of contending factions, which have,

have, in their turn, acquired predominance by violence and ſlaughter; and, as was to be expected, the moſt ſanguinary of thoſe factions has been ultimately triumphant: each of thoſe Revolutions has brought with it,

"——— Ruin upon Ruin, Rout on Rout,
"Confuſion worſe confounded." PAR. LOST.

IT is argued, however, that the People, by their ſubmiſſion to ſuch a Government (if a Government it can be called), ſhew themſelves decided in its favour, and determined to ſupport it. But does the violence, which is employed to produce that ſubmiſſion, prove it to be voluntary? Can there be a fairer criterion of the degree of reſiſtance, than the degree of force uſed to ſuppreſs that reſiſtance? The crouded priſons *

* The priſons in France are ſuppoſed to contain 200,000 wretched inhabitants. With reſpect to one, called *The Conciergerie*, at Paris, *Vouland*, in the name of the Committee of Safety, thus addreſſed the Convention on the 27th of January 1794.

"You have decreed that the priſoners to be tried by the "Revolutionary Tribunal, for Counter-Revolutionary pro-"jects, ſhould be confined in the priſon of *The Conciergerie*; "but the number of priſoners ſent there from all parts of the "Republic is ſo great, that this priſon will not hold them. "THIS PROVES THE MULTITUDE OF OUR ENEMIES."

—the

—the Revolutionary Tribunal †—the conſtant executions—the Guillotine, *permanent* or *ambulatory*—are *remarkable* proofs of the attachment of the People to the Government. One Baſtille has, by ſome perſons, been conſidered as ſufficient evidence, that the ancient ſyſtem was maintained by oppreſſion and conſtraint, although that priſon did not, at its boaſted demolition, contain even a ſingle priſoner charged with any crime againſt the State—but the Baſtilles, out of number, which have ſucceeded, demonſtrate *the perfection of Liberty, and the ſpontaneous acquieſcence of the People.* Whole reigns of Monarchs paſſed away, without one execution for Revolutionary attempts—ſo much was the Monarchy *deteſted:* but the copious ſtreams of blood, which now inceſſantly flow from the Altars of the Republic, denote the *preference* of the People for a Republican Government. Thoſe who reaſon to this effect intirely forget the ſyſtem of terror, which reigns throughout France, and which pervades every receſs of that miſerable country. It is by this formidable engine that the mercileſs

† By the ordinary returns of the Revolutionary Tribunal of Lyons for five days, there appears, in that ſpace, to have been there executed as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Guillotined, - - | 325 |
| Shot to death - - | 339 |
| | 664 |

dominion, which now prevails, has been gradually eſtabliſhed, and is ſtill upholden *. Were it not for the ſad evidence of fact, it would, in theory, appear impoſſible, for terror to obtain ſuch a ſway over a populous, civilized, and enlightened nation. Nor could ſuch a ſway have been obtained without the aid of that veil of Patriotiſm, which has been uſed to diſguiſe every meaſure of the Revolution, and which, thin and tranſparent as it is become, ſerves, to this hour, as a cover and pretext for the moſt ſhocking atrocites. The dominion of terror, thus obtained, is favoured and preſerved by the extinction of every religious and moral principle, and of every ſentiment of nature and humanity. That repugnance to the ſhedding of blood, which nature has kindly implanted in the human breaſt, is entirely over-

* "With one ſingle word you might compoſe the greateſt "part of the hiſtory of three Aſſemblies. This word is—FEAR.

"Fear ſanctiſied the reviſion of the Conſtitution, and occaſioned its being adopted.

"Fear of Republicaniſm, in the time of the Legiſlative "Aſſembly, ranged the Independents on the ſide of the "Feuillants; and fear has, in a great meaſure, produced "all the variations in the Convention.

"*Fear does not always ſhew itſelf under the ſame character.* "*Accordingly the Anarchiſts have the art to vary the form, in* "*order the more effectually to excite it; and, through fear, to* "*drag mankind along with them.*" BRISSOT, *to his Conſtituents.*

come,

come, and a thirſt for blood is ſubſtituted in its place. The violation of duties, hitherto eſteemed the moſt ſacred among men, is conſidered as the moſt exalted of virtues—and whoever betrays a friend, a father, or a huſband, to the furious Demons of Democracy, is held up as an object of admiration and applauſe. Hence univerſal diſtruſt prevails, every man views his neighbour with ſuſpicion or with apprehenſion, and no one dares to utter his groans, either for his country, his kindred, or himſelf. In ſuch a ſtate of things, the novel *phenomena* of arming the People in a maſs, and of compelling that maſs to march and to fight, in ſupport of a deteſted cauſe, are found not only practicable—but eaſy. Thoſe perſons, therefore, who infer the approbation of the people from their neglecting the opportunity, which "their being armed affords of righting themſelves," forget the ſituation of the Country, the nature of the governing Power, the means it employs, and the influence of Fear, when once it has gained poſſeſſion of the mind. For the People, even with arms in their hands, to right themſelves under ſuch a tyranny, would require reſolution, concert, and opportunity, which cannot be expected to exiſt, where confidence is intirely aboliſhed, and where vigilance and alarm are without intermiſſion. The blood-thirſty Rulers, with their numerous agents, are inceſſantly prying for victims, with that Argus-eyed watchfulneſs

which can only exiſt under Republican forms They ſcrutinize every word and every look, and they want no other evidence of guilt than ſuſpicion! "*Verba—vultus—in crimen detorquens.*" * They are moſt waſtefully prodigal of the lives of men, and ſeem to make it their maxim, that too much blood cannot be ſpilt, either on the ſcaffold or in the field. Whenever their infamous cauſe meets with a diſaſter, they inſtantly wreak their vengeance on defenceleſs victims—they call off the attention of the people by a ſudden burſt of fury, and find their remedy or their conſolation in human ſacrifices. They even celebrate their ſucceſſes in the ſame manner, and crown, with acts of cruelty and ſlaughter, their civic feſtivities †. Poſſeſſed of the public force, they convert it into an engine of ſeverity and terror, and they perpetrate their cruelties with a formality, which renders them ſtill more ſhocking and atrocious ‡. They employ only perſons of the moſt deſperate and abandoned character—the

* Tac.

† They have repeatedly amuſed themſelves on theſe occaſions with ſinking a veſſel laden with unfortunate victims of wanton barbarity.

‡ They have, however, on ſeveral occaſions, laid aſide all formality, finding it an impediment to the gratification of their inſatiate fury. They have authorized the Revolutionary Tribunal to convict without the *dilatory* proceſs of

the ready inſtruments of every crime; they have always at their command troops of armed banditti; and thus they hold peaceable and virtuous citizens in awe and ſubjection. They eaſily render the populace (whom, according to the invariable practice of Republicans, they denominate the People *) ſubſervient to their ſchemes, and

of examining witneſſes: they have even found the Guillotine itſelf too tardy in its operations—and whole troops of deſtined victims have, with a barbarity of which there is no example, been expoſed at once to the fire of grape ſhot, which laid the mangled carcaſes of the wounded in one heap with their more fortunate brethren, who had been at once relieved from their miſerable exiſtence.—Such are the wretches with whom it is propoſed to make peace!

* The People, far from exerciſing that Sovereignty, with the phantom of which they are flattered and cajoled, have infinitely leſs real influence than they poſſeſſed under their former Monarchy. With the name of Freedom in their mouths, and perpetually reſounded in their ears, they are in a ſtate of the vileſt ſubjection and abaſement. They are inſulted with the title of ſovereignty, but they are not allowed even the privilege of complaining.—They are told that they have the right to chuſe their Government, but, by a ſubſiſting Decree they are ſubjected to death, if they dare to propoſe the reſtoration of Monarchy. They are even made to promote every meaſure projected by their Tyrants; and to refuſe, to oppoſe, or even to heſitate, would be attended with certain and immediate deſtruction. Conſtitution after Conſtitution is therefore readily accepted by them as ſoon as propoſed. Nor is there any

and the ready inſtruments of terror and deſtruction. In ſhort, *theſe wretches* cement their dominion by blood, and confound and aſtoniſh by the enormity of their crimes, and by the celerity of their maſſacres! But although the inſtruments of death—in conſtant exerciſe, the axe perpetually ſuſpended, reſtrain the unfortunate people from throwing off their grievous yoke, the inſurrections which have exiſted in almoſt every part of the Republic, though ſuppreſſed, furniſh a deciſive proof of the deteſtation in which the ſubſiſting tyranny is held; while the ſtrenuous and perſevering efforts of the Chriſtian and Royal Army in Poitou and Brittany, denote the wiſh of the People to ſee reſtored—the Throne of their King, and the Altars of their God!

SUCH is the boaſted Union which is to *reſiſt* and *repel* the armies of almoſt all Europe. In judging of the reſources, which remain in aid of the ſame cauſe, care ſhould be taken not to confound them with the efforts of the moment. Deſolated by more than four years Revolution, France has ſcarcely any thing left of what conſtitutes the reſources of a Country, but her population—

plan, however abſurd or miſchievous, of which their eager acceptance would not be announced—by a *general diſcharge of artillery.*

She

She has neither commerce, credit, nor manufactures—even her agriculture is made ſubordinate to the occupation of war—ſhe is already pinched by ſcarcity, and menaced by the near and rapid approaches of inevitable famine—ſhe depends, both for ſubſiſtence and the means of War, on precarious ſupplies, clandeſtinely drawn, at an immenſe coſt, from thoſe Powers, who, under colour of a diſgraceful Neutrality, contribute to uphold her infernal cauſe, and who thereby nouriſh a viper which, if not cruſhed, will ſting them in their turn *—a Neutrality as ungenerous as it is impolitic; for thoſe Powers who adhere to it, owe their preſent ſafety and their future hopes to the War which the Belligerent Powers ſuſtain againſt France. The Tyrants of this exhauſted country are alſo reduced to the extremity, not only of appropriating, by rapacity and plunder, the property of individuals, wherever it can be found at home, but of deviſing unheard-of contrivances to draw, within their ſpoliating graſp, that which has been depoſited in other countries. This laſt reſource, the plunder of private property, muſt ſpeedily fail, as the only channels which can ſupply that property are dried up; and nothing will then remain but a paper currency, originally founded

* Genoa, America, Switzerland; ſay, has not this prediction been verified? Then take warning Pruſſia, Sweden, and Denmark.—*Note to the Collection.*

upon injuſtice and robbery, indebted for its internal credit to the compulſory limitation of the price of every commodity, and diſcredited abroad to the loweſt degree of nominal and fictitious value. Such is the condition of the Country to which it is propoſed to ſue for peace—a condition ſo diſtreſſing, as to amount almoſt to an adequate puniſhment, for the crimes which have produced it, and to convey an idea of juſt retribution, were it not that the good ſuſtain the greateſt ſhare of the calamity. The condition of human life, in the moſt ſavage and barbarous tribes, is truly enviable, when compared with that exhibited in France; and thoſe turbulent Characters, who abuſe the ſecurity and protection afforded by other States, would flee to the woods and deſarts, rather than truſt themſelves in that land of horror, In ſhort, this once flouriſhing Kingdom exhibits only the wreck of Society; and the impious Regicides, who have uſurped its dominion, have nothing left to defend themſelves with, but the ruins of the country which they have deſolated.

But this ſtatement by no means warrants us to deſpiſe the efforts, which they are now making, and which, for a time, they may have it in their power to make. Thoſe efforts bear, indeed, the genuine ſtamp of deſperation; they would themſelves produce the ruin of France, even if ſhe

were in her priſtine ſtate of proſperity. But let Europe beware of their ſucceſs, for then the ruin will be general. The monſters who direct them, ſeem juſtly aware that only a ſingle ſtruggle remains in behalf of their infamous cauſe, and they collect all their ſtrength upon the occaſion. To prolong their domination, fleeting as it is ferocious, they feel no regret in ſacrificing the permanent intereſts of their Country, and in inflicting on it wounds, from which it cannot recover for ages. Conſcious that humanity muſt every where refuſe impunity to deeds like theirs, they ſeem indifferent about their own fate, ſo that their deſtruction come not alone; and they endeavour, Sampſon-like, to pull down the edifice of Society, although they are ſure to be buried in its ruins. Hence thoſe agonies of convulſive rage, which juſtly excite our aſtoniſhment and alarm. Beſides, theſe impious demagogues, able and active as they are deſperate and unprincipled, reſort to means, which no regular Government could employ. They make robbery, ſacrilege, impiety, and murder, the inſtruments of their deſigns; and they cruſh domeſtic oppoſition by meaſures, which would overthrow any legitimate power upon earth. They arm the People in a maſs, drive into the field all the youth of the Country (on whoſe labours depends the ſubſiſtence of another year), and ſtimulate them to fight, undiſciplined as they are,

like

like deſperadoes, by the intoxicating fumes of liquor, and the ſtill more intoxicating fumes of Anarchical Fanaticiſm;—while, to counteract all remaining influence of fear, as well of diſaffection, the awful Guillotine, which firſt compelled them to march, ſtands behind, and points out a much greater danger than that of advancing againſt the enemy. Thus do they lead army after army to ſlaughter—and thus, by dint of numbers and of inceſſant attacks, do they haraſs and fatigue the regular forces oppoſed to them; which, notwithſtanding their advantage in point of diſcipline, are obliged to retire from the impetuous and overwhelming torrent.

SUCH efforts cannot laſt long, nor be often repeated. But to fruſtrate them demands, as it deſerves, every poſſible degree of vigilance and exertion. The Powers, who are combined in the cauſe of Society and Humanity, ſhould neglect nothing that can conduce to their ſucceſs. Their reſources, thank Heaven! exceed beyond all compariſon thoſe of their adverſary*; and if they apply

* Beſides the natural diſproportion between the ſtrength and reſources of France, and thoſe of nearly the reſt of Europe collectively—there cannot be a greater contraſt than that which is exhibited between the condition of France and that of the Coaleſced Powers. On the one hand, we ſee a population, incredibly diminiſhed by emigration, proſcription,

apply thoſe reſources with reſolution and vigour, with promptitude and unanimity—their ſucceſs may be conſidered as morally certain. Hitherto they have certainly erred in their calculation of the degree of reſiſtance they ſhould have to encounter. Nor is this ſtrange: for they could

ſcription, maſſacre, unremitting executions, and that barbarous kind of Warfare, in which the value of human life is eſtimated as nothing, and the want of diſcipline is compenſated by the numbers, that are driven to ſlaughter—an enfeebled and diminiſhed navy, which dares not ſhew itſelf out of port—a total failure of commerce and manufacture—and a want of every article, which is neceſſary either for ſubſiſtence or for War, and which commerce alone can ſupply: while internally there is neither law, order, nor ſecurity; but uproar, confuſion, and horror, are univerſally predominant. On the other hand, the Combined Powers, far from experiencing any ſenſible loſs of population, ſuſtain only the ordinary loſſes incident to War; loſſes which are provided againſt, as much as poſſible, by care, diſcipline, generalſhip, plentiful ſupplies of food and cloathing, and every humane attention to life and health. We ſee alſo the commerce of the States at war with France proſperous and flouriſhing, compenſating the loſs of their trade with that country, by participating her numerous branches of foreign commerce:—the marine of the Naval Powers in full vigour, and abundantly more than ſufficient to protect their own trade, and to prevent that of the enemy from reviving:—while at home, their States enjoy the ſubſtantial bleſſings of orderly and well-regulated Society, and all ranks diſplay an unparalleled ardour to ſupport a War, on the ſucceſs of which depends the continuance of thoſe bleſſings, to the preſent generation, and the tranſmiſſion of them to poſterity.

not

not ſuppoſe it poſſible, that a ſufficient degree of ſeverity could be put in practice, to reſtrain that internal oppoſition which ſo grievous a tyranny, as this which prevails in France, could not fail to produce. Hereafter, if they err, it behoves them to take eſpecial care that it be on the ſafe ſide. For this purpoſe they ſhould make it their maxim, that every exertion in their power is indiſpenſably neceſſary: and ſhould they employ greater means than might poſſibly ſuffice, for the attainment of their object, they will be amply rewarded by accelerating the return of tranquillity and ſecurity.

We are ſometimes told, that when the War ſhall be felt in its burdens, it will become unpopular, and that by exciting diſcontent, it may prove the ſource of confuſion, and even *endanger the Conſtitution itſelf.* Such inſinuations are far from being complimentary to the good ſenſe and good diſpoſitions of the Country. The Britiſh People have not only with cheerfulneſs, but with ardour, ſupported Wars undertaken in defence of the national honour, or of the general ſecurity of Europe; and they will ſcarcely ſhrink from a War, which, beſides having in view the above important conſiderations, has for its object the preſervation of their Conſtitution, and of their exiſtence as a free and independent nation. Every motive that has ever yet exiſted—every motive

that

that inſult, provocation, and aggreſſion—or that a deſire of vengeance, or a ſenſe of danger can inſpire, to ſtimulate to a vigorous and animated proſecution of a War, occurs, with unexampled force on the preſent occaſion. Nay, motives which have never before exiſted, even in idea, call loudly upon us to diſtinguiſh this from every former War, by unprecedented vigour and exertion. It has for centuries been the native ſentiment of Britiſh minds, that neither blood nor treaſure ſhould be ſpared, to prevent the aggrandiſement of the French Monarchy. And ſhall we now, for the firſt time, cringe to the power of France, tremble at her wrath, and yield to her ſpirit of conqueſt and domination, becauſe ſhe has aſſumed the name of a Republic—becauſe ſhe has renounced all ſenſe of honour and humanity—becauſe ſhe is transformed from a poliſhed to a barbarous nation, retaining the arts of civilization only to become more dreadfully ſavage—and becauſe ſhe claims a right, by a profanation of the ſacred name of Liberty, to excite inſurrection in every other country, and to overturn every other Government? Never had we ſuch grounds of hoſtility with a French Monarch—never was ſucceſs ſo indiſpenſable as it is now. The queſtion before us is not, whether the Britiſh Flag ſhall maintain its honour, or the Britiſh Name its reſpect—whether we ſhall preſerve our Commerce or our Colonies,

nor

nor even whether we ſhall continue to enjoy the mild and benign influence of our Laws, Religion, and inimitable form of Government;—but, whether, without any Laws, Religion, or Government, we ſhall become a prey to devouring anarchy, and experience the horrors, of which France preſents ſo dreadful a ſpectacle, and which ſhe endeavours to render univerſal. Such a War may, indeed, be ſtiled a War *pro aris et focis*—a War for the defence, not merely of property, but of public worſhip, of domeſtic comforts, of uſeful labour, of the perſonal rights of the huſbandman and mechanick—rights, which infinitely ſurpaſs all property in point of value, and which it is the greateſt boaſt of our Conſtitution to guard inviolate. Shall we be told then that the burdens of ſuch a War, are likely to excite diſcontent and commotion? Or, can a greater libel be uttered againſt Engliſhmen than to inſinuate, that they would heſitate to face any danger, to endure any burdens, or to diſplay any degree of energy, in ſuch a cauſe?

It is remarkable, that the perſons, who are ſo ſolicitous for the ſafety of the Conſtitution, as to ſhudder at the idea of a War, which affords the only means of preſerving our independence as a Nation, do not ſeem at all ſenſible of the real dangers to which the Conſtitution is expoſed from the machinations of thoſe traitors, who

are

are known to conſpire its deſtruction, or from the unbounded licentiouſneſs of the Preſs, which is, of all its enemies, the moſt formidable. That a free Preſs is an indiſpenſable ſafeguard of Civil Liberty, no one will attempt to diſpute. But the things that are moſt valuable and uſeful in themſelves, are the moſt dangerous in the abuſe; and if ever Britain ſhould loſe her Conſtitution, it will be by means of the PRESS. It is only from this rampart of our rights and liberties that we are aſſailable; and hence the moſt deſtructive artillery is inceſſantly playing on our moſt valuable eſtabliſhments. It is, indeed, difficult to obſerve the daring malignity, by which many of the productions of the preſs are diſtinguiſhed, without entertaining a ſerious apprehenſion, that the order of things muſt be very precarious, which may be thus inſulted and attacked with impunity. The vaſt quantity of malignant poiſon, which is conſtantly poured into the public mind, cannot fail at length to produce a pernicious effect:—adminiſtered in every mode of preparation, of which the preſs is ſuſceptible, from the rude form of the incendiary Handbill, to the more elegant decoction of a Review, it muſt by degrees, if not checked, corrupt the ſyſtem. The operation may, indeed, be very gradual, and almoſt imperceptible; but in a moment of fermentation or convulſion, the accumulated effect may be ſuddenly fatal. But the perſons in queſtion ſee none of theſe dangers. Though unwilling

ling to rely on the loyalty of the people, to defend their Conſtitution againſt a foreign enemy, they would willingly expoſe that loyalty to all the arts of ſeduction. They would give the internal enemies of the Conſtitution every poſſible chance of effecting its deſtruction. Confiding altogether in its intrinſic excellence, and in the known attachment of the people (although they are conſtantly labouring to weaken that attachment, by the promotion of diſcontent), they oppoſe every attempt to enforce thoſe laws, which are made for its ſecurity; and inſtead of aſſiſting, they vilify and abuſe every Magiſtrate*, who endeavours to repreſs the diſturbers of public order. They dread nothing but the effect of a neceſſary tax in a neceſſary War; and they laugh at the *alarm* of thoſe, who thought it prudent to unite, in aid of the Magiſtracy and of the Laws, when, in purſuance of the Conventional Decrees, promiſing Fraternity and Aſſiſtance to all People diſpoſed to revolt againſt their Government, the Jacobinical Rulers of France openly conſpired, with the traitorous ſubjects of England, for the ſubverſion of our Coonſtitution—when Clubs were formed in almoſt every pariſh, to give effect to ſuch a conſpiracy—and when indefatigable pains were taken, and had long been taken, with evident effect, not only to excite the deſperate and abandoned, but to convince the induſtrious

* Sir James Sanderſon, Bart. when Lord Mayor of the City of London, was on this account moſt virulently attacked by the Oppoſition.

Million,

Million, that a better ſtate of things could eaſily be obtained, than one founded on their *ill-requited* labour, and cemented by the ſweat of their brows.

ADMIRABLE as is the Conſtitution, the confidence of thoſe who would truſt its ſecurity to the protection of its own excellence, rather than to that of the Laws, ſavours much more of treachery, or, at leaſt, of raſhneſs, than of rational and ſteady attachment. Mad, indeed, would be the individual, who, relying on the vigour of his health, ſhould ruſh into the midſt of contagion. The body politic, like the body natural, is full of juices, which, in the moſt perfect ſtate, are ſuſceptible of contamination. The ſocial ſyſtem, however perfect, requires, for its preſervation, the conſtant ſupport of that legal authority, on which it is founded:—deprived thereof, it would tend directly towards diſſolution. Vain would be the wiſeſt proviſions for individual ſecurity, if the ſafety of all were left expoſed to the inroads of licentiouſneſs and violence. At all times, therefore, ſeditious practices call for the vigilance and the vengeance of the Laws; but, at the preſent moment, when Sedition, encouraged by unlimited ſucceſs in a neighbouring country, rears its audacious creſt much higher than ever, and, in the boldneſs, malignity, and extent of its projects, greatly ex-

ceeds all former daring—at ſuch a moment, every friend, not merely of the Conſtitution, but of Order and Society, is called upon to lend his watchfulneſs and his aid, in ſupport of the common cauſe. No pains are ſpared—no artifice is neglected—to ſubvert the ancient and noble edifice of Britiſh greatneſs and felicity. There is no ſhape which Sedition, the Arch-Fiend of Society, does not aſſume, to effect this deſtructive purpoſe. Proteus-like, he varies his form with the greateſt facility. Now, the daring, undiſguiſed Demagogue, defying the Laws, braving the Legiſlature, and courting proſecution;—then, the wily Incendiary, inflaming the paſſions of the profligate, deluding the ſimplicity of the young, the ignorant, and unwary, (" *Imperitos animos impellere*;") and infuſing, by every channel, that malicious ingenuity can diſcover, reſtleſſneſs and diſcontent;—next, the ſpecious Reformer, profeſſing an enthuſiaſtic regard for the Conſtitution, but calling for reform with a view to ſubverſion;—and, anon, the bold Innovator, diſplaying ideal forms of ſpeculative perfection, to enſnare us to quit our ſolid hold of ſubſtantial felicity. If to repel theſe manifold attacks—theſe unceaſing attempts to demoliſh by force, or to undermine by artifice—the Conſtitution ſhould reſort to the protection of the Laws, every obſtacle that can be deviſed is thrown in its way, to deprive it of

that

that advantage;—every topic of a popular nature is employed, to render the adminiſtration of the moſt eſſential branch of criminal juſtice odious, or ſuſpected: the rights of juries—the freedom of the preſs—the liberty of the ſubject—theſe, and many other topics, are groſsly perverted, to favour the eſcape of ſtirrers up of ſedition. The common felon is left to take the chance of a fair and impartial trial; but the offender, who attempts to undermine the foundations of all ſecurity, public and private, and to pull down, on our heads, the ſubſtantial Fabrick, which alone can afford us ſhelter or protection, is ſure to find patrons, whoſe countenance makes him bold, and whoſe protecting hand attends him through every ſtage of the proceedings*. And ſhould a Jury (neither miſled by the arts of ſophiſtry, nor obliged, after a long ſtruggle, to yield to the invincible obſtinacy of a diſaffected interloper) ſupport the Conſtitution by their verdict†, the ſpirit of ſedition, untameable as it

* MAIDSTONE, *to wit.*—Note to the Collection.

† Several recent verdicts have intercepted the progreſs of Juſtice againſt offenders, who had publiſhed libels of the moſt flagrant kind, of the deſign and tendency of which to excite a ſpirit of diſaffection to lawful authority, no man in the country entertains the leaſt doubt. Such verdicts are alarming *mementos* of the inſecurity of every thing that is, and ought to be, dear to Engliſhmen; for they prove, that the State cannot depend upon the protection of the laws. They afford triumph to ſedition, and encou-

it is deſperate, exults in diſgrace and puniſhment, and from the depths of a priſon iſſues freſh libels, more inflammatory than the firſt, and affects to triumph over the juſtice of the Country †.

To crown all the other fallacies and miſrepreſentations by which it is attempted to prejudice the public opinion againſt the War, it is charged with having for its object an interference in the Government of France, and with violating thereby

ragement to revolt. Every ſuch verdict is infinitely more alarming than a defeat either by ſea or land.—In vain ſhall our fleets and armies defend us againſt foreign enemies, if the Laws be impotent againſt domeſtic traitors. If Juries will not ſupport the Conſtitution, of which they form a main pillar, it certainly muſt fall;—but they ought to conſider, that they will be buried in its ruins.

† "They manage theſe matters better in"—Scotland, where ſeveral daring offenders of the above claſs have been lately ſentenced to tranſportation; a ſentence peculiarly appoſite to ſuch a caſe. For, beſides that a diſpoſition to this offence is remarkably infectious, and perſons contaminated thereby are indefatigably active in ſpreading the contagion, nothing can be more juſt and reaſonable than thoſe who are diſſatisfied with the Government of a Country, and who ſeek to ſubvert it, ſhould be diſmiſſed to another region, where they will neither have an opportunity of effectuating their miſchievous deſigns, nor of corrupting others with their pernicious principles. Were the Legiſlature to frame a law for England upon this principle, it would tend not only to the effectual preſervation of our rights and liberties, but would alſo give great ſatisfaction to the real friends of law and order.

thoſe principles, which are eſſential to the Independence of States. There cannot be a groſſer perverſion than is contained in the above ſtatement, in each of its parts. It is undoubtedly true, that we are reduced to the neceſſity of interfering in the affairs of France; and the War, which France has declared againſt us, gives us the right, upon general principles, ſo to interfere *. But this interference, far from being the object

* "Quæ ad finem juris conſequendi ſunt neceſſaria, ad ea jus habere intelligimur."—*Grot. de jur. Bel. et Pac. Tom. 2. Lib. 3. Cap. 1. Sec. 2.*

"When the end is lawful, he who has a right to proſecute "this end, is warranted in the uſe of all neceſſary means to "attain it. The end of a juſt war is to revenge, or to pre-"vent injury; that is, to procure, by force, the juſtice which "cannot otherwiſe be obtained; to compel an unjuſt perſon "to repair an injury already done, or to give ſecurities againſt "any wrong threatened by him. On a declaration of War, "therefore, this Nation has a right of doing againſt the "enemy whatever is neceſſary to this juſtifiable end of bring-"ing him to reaſon, and obtaining juſtice and ſecurity from "him."

"The buſineſs of a juſt War gives a right of doing againſt "the enemy whatever is neceſſary for weakening him; for "diſabling him from making any farther reſiſtance in ſupport "of his injuſtice, and the moſt effectual, the moſt proper "methods may be choſen, provided they have nothing odious, "be not unlawful in themſelves, or exploded by the law of "nature."—VATTEL, *B. 3. Chap. 8. Sec.* 136, 138.

Theſe principles completely juſtify our interference in the affairs of France, *flagrante bello*, and they would have juſtified that interference even if the Declaration of War had come from us, after the aggreſſions which France had made

object of the War, is only the means, by which that object may be attained. It has been often repeated, and, however obvious, it cannot be repeated too often, that the object of the War is *ſecurity*. This is all we deſire, for having it, we have every thing—but it is indiſpenſable, for, without it, we have nothing that we can call our own.—In the firſt inſtance, indeed, the War had for its object our immediate defence againſt an actual attack. But we have alſo in this War to provide for our ultimate and permanent ſecurity againſt unprecedented dangers, to which we are expoſed, and irreparable miſchiefs, which the enemy ſeeks to bring upon us. Theſe dangers and miſchiefs ariſe out of a new ſyſtem, which has been introduced into France. A ſyſtem of univerſal moleſtation—having, for its avowed object, to ſpread confuſion in every other State, and to ſubvert every exiſting Government, by the aſſiſtance of France, actually proffered to all diſaffected ſubjects. The very exiſtence of ſuch

and perſiſted in by the Decrees of Fraternity, and of Dec. 15; and her repeated attempts, both before and after thoſe Decrees, to excite the people of this Country to revolt. For the ſame writer declares it to be "an atrocious injury, if any one attempts, by his emiſſaries, to excite ſubjects to revolt." Ib. B. 2. Chap. 4. Sec. 56.

Mr. Fox has ſuggeſted another argument to prove our interference juſtifiable. In alluſion to the ſpeech from the Throne in 1787, upon the ſubject of Holland, that Gentleman ſaid, "When there are two parties in a country, one of "them hoſtile, and another friendly to us, we have a right "to interfere, in ſupport of that which is friendly."

a ſyſtem is incompatible with the ſafety of neighbouring States. We are therefore compelled, by the ſupreme and paramount neceſſity of ſelf-preſervation, to *interfere* for the demolition of ſuch a ſyſtem. It is not for the ſake of France, or of any party there, that we thus interfere. We ſhould not pretend to inſiſt that French anarchy ſhall ceaſe, if that anarchy did not diſturb our own quiet, and expoſe our own ſafety. It is not its internal effect, but its external tendency, to which we object. Theſe are the grounds of our interference, which is, therefore, no violation of the rights of an independent State, and in which the duty we owe to ourſelves requires us to perſiſt, until the cauſe of our danger be entirely removed.

To juſtify ſuch an interference, it is not even neceſſary to refer to the War, in which we are engaged, or to the attack, which has been made upon us. We ſhould have been juſtified in commencing the War, for the expreſs purpoſe of deſtroying the hoſtile ſyſtem which France had adopted. The right to do ſo, far from being an infringement on the privileges of an independent State, ariſes directly out of the general principle, that one State has no right to interfere in the Government or domeſtic concerns of another State. This principle lies at the very foundation of the independence of Nations. But to produce

its effect, its obligation muſt be univerſal. muſt bind all, or it cannot protect any. The State that claims the benefit of its operation, muſt ſubmit to its authority. The baſis of the independence of States is Equality—that is, Equality as to thoſe rights, which are eſſential to Sovereignty. But Equality of rights cannot exiſt without reciprocity of obligation *. It is neceſſary, therefore, in ſupport of the principle contended for, that no power ſhould be ſuffered to exiſt which diſclaims its authority:—were it to be extended to the protection of ſuch a Power, it would be made the inſtrument of its own deſtruction. France has renounced this principle, by adopting a ſyſtem of univerſal aggreſſion and interference, in open and avowed defiance of the rights of *all* other independent nations; and ſhe has thereby not only denied its authority in theory, but has violated it in practice. So groſs and direct an infringement of the right of general ſecurity has never before exiſted in fact, nor, probably, in ſuppoſition. But an eminent writer on the Law of Nations (already quoted), on whoſe authority our right of interference, with ſo miſchievous a ſyſtem, was lately attempted to be denied in a Legiſlative Aſſembly, has with a

* From a neceſſary conſequence of this Equality, what is permitted to one is permitted to all—and what is not permitted to one, is not permitted to any other.

VATTEL—*Preliminaries, Sect.* 19.

kind

kind of prophetic impulſe, developed principles which fully meet the preſent caſe, and which juſtify both the interference itſelf, in the full extent to which it is carried, and the Confederacy which has been formed with a view to provide effectually, for future ſecurity. This writer obſerves, generally, " In vain does Nature preſcribe to nations, " as well as to individuals, the care of their ſelf- " preſervation, and of advancing their own per- " fection and happineſs, if it does not give them " a right to preſerve themſelves from every thing " that can render this care ineffectual. It is " this right of preſervation from all injury that " is called the *right of ſecurity*." The violation of this right of ſecurity, he aſſerts, produces the right of reſiſtance—of obtaining reparation—and of inflicting puniſhment;—" which " propoſitions," he ſays, " are ſo many prin- " ciples that furniſh various foundations for a " juſt War." But with the cleareſt inſight into futurity, he could not have uttered any thing more applicable to ſubſiſting circumſtances than what follows;

" In ſhort, the offended has a right to provide " for his ſecurity for the future, and to puniſh " the offender, by inflicting upon him a pain " capable of deterring him afterwards from the " like attempts, and of intimidating thoſe who " ſhall be tempted to imitate him. He may " even,

" even, if neceſſary, put the aggreſſor out of the " condition to injure him. He makes uſe of his " right in all theſe meaſures, when guided by " reaſon; and if any evil reſults from it to him " who lays him under the neceſſity of acting thus, " he can accuſe none but his own injuſtice.

" If then there be any where a nation of a " *reſtleſs* and *miſchievous* diſpoſition, always " ready to *injure others*, to traverſe their deſigns, " and TO RAISE DOMESTIC TROUBLES; it is not " to be doubted, that all have a right to join, " in order to repreſs, chaſtiſe, and PUT IT EVER " AFTER OUT OF ITS POWER TO INJURE " THEM."

VATTEL, Book I. C. 4.

WITHOUT, however, the weight of ſuch authority, it is ſelf-evident, that to preſerve the principle which denies the right of one State to interfere in the domeſtic concerns of another, we muſt except from its operation a Nation of free-booters and incendiaries, which, deſtitute of regular Government itſelf, ſeeks to deprive every other Country of that advantage. Of ſuch an exception, it may truly be ſaid, " *Exceptio pro-* " *bat regulam.*" The application of the principle to ſuch a caſe would ſoon reduce not only this, but every other principle of the Law of Nations, to a dead letter. Nor would any thing further be wanting to give full effect to the Decree

of

of Fraternity—to the numerous other claims of France to give Law to the whole world—and to that important function, aſcribed to the Convention by *Danton*, when, addreſſing himſelf to that Auguſt Body, he ſaid, "The National Convention of France ſhould be a Committee of "Inſurrection againſt all the Kings in the Univerſe."

The general reaſoning above reſorted to, applies, with peculiar force, to the ſtate of European ſociety; in which it is more particularly the eſſential intereſt of every State, that other States ſhould be ſubject to regular and eſtabliſhed Government; for otherwiſe there would be no ſecurity whatever for the obſervance of the Law of Nations, and of the Stipulations of Treaties. Europe muſt be conſidered as a large community, compoſed of divers States, which are independent of each other in their internal concerns, but intimately connected in reſpect of their common intereſt *. Their mutual harmony and the welfare

* Europe forms a political ſyſtem, a body, where the whole is connected by the relations and different intereſts of Nations inhabiting this part of the world. It is not as anciently, a confuſed heap of detached pieces, each of which, though of itſelf very little concerned in the fate of others, and ſeldom regarded things which did not immediately relate to it. The continual attention of Sovereigns to what is

on

fare of all are conſulted and promoted by ſuch a connection, as are the harmony and happineſs of individuals by the connection ariſing out of Society. But the exiſtence of regular Government, at the head of the reſpective States of which this large Republic is compoſed, is eſſential to the continuance of their beneficial connection; for ſuch government is the only ſolid bond of their union, the only inſtrument by which that union can be formed and preſerved, and the only ſecurity for mutual reſpect, and for an adherence to engagements. All Europe has, therefore, an indiſpenſable intereſt in the internal condition of all the States, of which it is compoſed, and, of courſe, a right of interference, to the extent of that intereſt. A right, not indeed to preſcribe or regulate, in any ſhape, the form of Government to which any particular Country ſhall be ſubject, but to inſiſt that no country ſhall pretend to exiſt without ſome fixed and ſtable Government. For it is impoſſible that any country ſhould ſo exiſt, without endangering the repoſe and ſafety of every

on the carpet, the conſtant reſidence of Miniſters, and the *perpetual negociations, make Europe a kind of Republic, the Members of which, though independent, unite, through the ties of common intereſt, for the maintenance of order and liberty.* Hence aroſe that famous ſcheme of the political equilibrium, or Balance of Power, by which is underſtood ſuch a diſpoſition of things, as no power is able abſolutely to predominate, or to preſcribe laws to others.—VATTEL, B. 3. C. 3. Sec. 47.

State

State within the reach of its influence; without, in ſhort, being a nation of a reſtleſs and miſchievous diſpoſition, always ready to injure others, to traverſe their deſigns, and to RAISE DOMESTIC TROUBLES. But the ſituation, the extent, the natural and acquired reſources of France, render her internal condition abundantly more important to the reſt of Europe, than that of any other State can poſſibly be, and, of courſe, create the greateſt general intereſt, that ſhe ſhould not throw off the control of order and regular Government. If the extenſive territories of France were to be ſwallowed up by the ocean which waſhes their ſhores, the ſyſtem of Europe would be unſettled, and its balance deſtroyed; great contention and diſorder would take place before a new balance could be gained, and no State would be ſure of preſerving its proper weight in the ſcale. But the Anarchy of France is infinitely more injurious to other States than her annihilation could be; and it would be a far leſs calamity, for that country to be blotted out from the face of the globe, than to become a ſource of general confuſion and revolt—a burning volcano, inceſſantly diſturbing other countries by its exploſions, and pouring forth its deſtructive lava in every direction.

IN every point of view, therefore, the interference, which is cenſured, is in the ſtricteſt ſenſe juſti-

juſtifiable. It is even neceſſary, as well for the general ſecurity of Society, as for that of the Political Syſtem of Europe. It is neceſſary to obtain a reaſonable ground of expectation that we ſhall be ſecure from future moleſtation—that Treaties ſhall be binding, and the Laws of Nations reſpected. Inſtead of being at variance with any eſtabliſhed principle, it has for its object the preſervation of every principle, which is eſſential to the independence of States, and the exiſtence of civilized ſociety. It was not begun until the ſyſtem, againſt which it is directed, had interfered with our rights as an independent people. It is the only means by which an effectual remedy can be obtained for an evil which expoſes every thing that is valuable to mankind to deſtruction. It goes, as every remedy ought, to the cauſe of the evil, and affords the only chance of a radical cure. Every other application would operate only as a palliative; and would, at beſt, but cicatrize the wound, leaving it to burſt out again with additional violence. In ſhort, ſuch interference is the only road to peace; for while the Jacobin ſyſtem is ſuffered to remain in any form, peace is evidently unattainable.

The manner in which our interference is conducted (as well as the principles upon which it is founded), is preciſely ſuch as tends to preſerve, in the moſt effectual way, the rights of independent

pendent States, and even thoſe of France itſelf. The interpoſition which we have been compelled to make, is not carried further than the neceſſity by which it is created and ſanctioned. We do not claim any right to dictate a Government to France. We do not pretend to exerciſe our own judgment reſpecting the form of Government which may *beſt ſuit* that country, nor to indulge our ſpeculations on the queſtion, whether this or that form be better or worſe, as applied thereto. We only inſiſt that a Government, ſolid, ſtable, permanent, and reſponſible, ſhall be ſettled; and we admit that beyond this, our interference would be an unjuſt intruſion. Were we to aſſume a right to eſtabliſh the happineſs, or the liberties, of France, we might uſe ſuch a pretext to cover our own views of ambition, and ſhould at once deſtroy the political freedom of the country, and endanger that of every country. No idea can be more prepoſterous, or arrogant, than that of one State pretending to confer liberty on another. Such was the maſk under which the French Republicans carried havock, deſolation, and chains, into the Auſtrian Netherlands, Holland, Germany, and Savoy; and every civilized State is intereſted to diſclaim a principle, which, in itſelf, is unjuſt, and which is ſo liable to perverſion.

But in order to ſubject France to regular and ſettled Government, and thereby to bring her, once

once more, within the pale of civilized and orderly ſociety, the moſt obvious, and, in all appearance, the only effectual mode of employing our interference, is to aſſiſt the loyal part of the French Nation, in reſtoring their lawful Sovereign to the Throne of his anceſtors. Without adverting at preſent to the common intereſt which every Sovereign has in the re-eſtabliſhment of a Throne, which has been ſubverted by principles that are eſſentially hoſtile to all Thrones; France has no other proſpect of regaining a ſtate of order and tranquillity, than by again ſubmitting to that Government, the overthrow of which has been the cauſe of her Anarchy. But however that may be, the Powers of Europe cannot wait the reſult of her conſtitutional experiments, but are obliged, for their own ſafety and repoſe, to inſiſt that ſhe ſhall ſpeedily poſſeſs a Government, capable of maintaining the cuſtomary relations of civilized States. To ſecure this object, they have no other definite or practicable means, conſiſtently with the independence of France, than to direct their efforts towards the Reſtoration of the French Monarchy. This then is the moſt honourable, as well as the only practicable principle, upon which the Combined Powers can conduct their interference *.

It

* This principle, in addition to its other recommendations, has alſo the ſanction of Treaties. In the Appendix

to

It is objected, indeed, that the effect of ſuch an interpoſition would be to aſſiſt in reſtoring Deſpotiſm. In anſwer to this objection it might eaſily be proved, that the ancient Government of France is not only favourable, but eſſential, to its enjoyment of a ſuitable portion of genuine liberty—that its re-eſtabliſhment affords the only means by which that country can hope for a reſtoration of order, without which there can be no freedom—that, according to a phraſe much uſed, it is the only rallying point for the nation—and that, independently of ſuch advantages, a return of the former ſtate of France, in exchange for the preſent, would be unſpeakably advantageous in reſpect of liberty, ſecurity, and every benefit which ſociety can produce. But ſuch conſiderations are foreign to the preſent queſtion. We have no juriſdiction to determine what would be the deſpotiſm, or what ſalutary freedom with

to Mr. Burke's three Memorials on French Affairs, publiſhed ſince his death, both the Triple Alliance in 1717, and the Quadruple Alliance in 1718, are quoted, in ſupport of the right to interfere in behalf of the French King. By the latter of theſe Treaties, the contracting Powers, England, France, Holland, and the Emperor of Germany, guarantee the right and ſucceſſion to the Kingdom of France, *againſt all perſons whatſoever who ſhall preſume to diſturb the order of the ſaid ſucceſſion.*—Note to the Collection.

regard to France:—nay, Freedom itſelf would be deſpotiſm of the worſt kind, if it were poſſible to be impoſed upon her at the diſcretion of ſtrangers. Were the Combined Powers to aſſiſt a Faction in introducing ſome novel ſcheme of Government, under pretence that it would be favourable to the happineſs of France, they would arrogate to themſelves a right, to which they are not intitled, and which cannot exiſt, conſiſtently with the real intereſts of Society. They cannot in propriety exert their influence further than for the reſtoration of the Government which has been ſubverted, and becauſe it is *that* which has been ſubverted.—Were they even to introduce modifications into that Government, (beſides that ſuch an attempt would be prepoſterous during the confuſion of the preſent moment), they would ſtep beyond the line, which they are bound to obſerve, and aſſume a right incompatible with the principle which alone can warrant, and which ought to limit, their interference. But in being inſtrumental to the reſtoration of the lawful and ancient Monarchy, purely and ſimply, they violate no principle, they exerciſe no alarming influence, nor eſtabliſh any precedent at all dangerous for the future. Their recommendation of that Government is not founded on an opinion that it is the beſt Government for France, but on the conſideration that, being the Government which has been

been ſo long eſtabliſhed in that country, it is the only one which they can favour, without aſſuming a right of deciding for France in that reſpect. In aſſiſting to reſtore it, they do no more than is conſiſtent with honour, juſtice, and general policy —and what it would be for the happineſs and ſecurity of their own States, to be done with reſpect to themſelves, if their lawful authority had been obliged, by rebellion, to give place to Anarchy. Should the Monarchy of France be reinſtated through the interference of the Combined Powers, being founded in ancient right, it would not derive its authority from the aſſiſtance by which it is reſtored, but from antecedent title, and it would inſtantly reſume its original independence with regard to other States. But were any other Government to ariſe under their auſpices (ſuppoſing even that any other ſyſtem could be rendered permanent), the Government of France, inſtead of being reſtored, would in a manner be preſcribed by a foreign force, and a foreign influence might be exerted to maintain, or to modify, what it had been the means of eſtabliſhing. Thus would a manifeſt violation be made of the principle, that one State has no right to interfere in the internal government of another—the independence of France would be deſtroyed—that of other countries ſhaken—a ſource of future diſturbances and Revolutions would be opened—and the other Powers would not only defeat their

grand object of eſtabliſhing general ſecurity, on a ſolid and permanent baſis, but would alſo introduce a precedent, which might, at ſome future time, be *turned againſt themſelves.* In ſhort, the ſecurity of all lawful Government—the well-being of Society—the freedom and independence of States—the repoſe of Europe and of mankind—the intereſt of the preſent age and of poſterity, ſeem to require, that the French Revolution ſhould be terminated by the re-eſtabliſhment of that legitimate authority, the ſubverſion of which has produced ſo many calamities.

# REFLECTIONS

SUBMITTED TO THE

# CONSIDERATION

OF THE

# *COMBINED POWERS.*

PUBLISHED IN SEPTEMBER,

1794.

# REFLECTIONS, &c. &c.

THAT the preſent Criſis admits of no other alternative than the extermination of the ſyſtem, which now prevails in France, or the diſſolution of civilized ſociety, is a political truth, which is hourly gaining ground in the conviction of mankind. Indeed, the progreſs of the miſchief, which menaces Europe with deſtruction, has been ſo rapid and extenſive, that much leſs remains to be done than has been already effected, towards the full accompliſhment of that dreadful menace. It is, indeed, calculated to excite the utmoſt degree of aſtoniſhment, that, in the comparatively ſhort period of the French Revolution, the evil ſhould have acquired its preſent force and magnitude; but, conſidering what has happened, it would ſcarcely appear ſurprizing, if the concluſion of another term, of the like extent, were to witneſs the total ſubverſion of order and government, at leaſt throughout this quarter of the Globe.

This ſtatement, however, though equally juſt and alarming, is far from proving the caſe to be deſperate. The growth of the miſchief has been as much owing to the want of timely reſiſtance, as to its own tendency to ſpread and eſtabliſh itſelf, wherever it is not ſeaſonably and effectually oppoſed: and the failure which has hitherto attended every endeavour to reſtore general quiet and ſecurity, if viewed in connection with the cauſes to which it may be juſtly aſcribed, inſtead of exciting deſpondency, ſhould ſtimulate to additional exertion. It ſeems to have been too readily admitted as a principle in the conduct of the War, that ordinary means would ſuffice, and that the united force of ſo many Powers, exerted in the uſual manner, could not fail to ſucceed againſt the ſingle force of France. Such a calculation, which, in ordinary wars might be ſafely relied on, is by no means applicable to a conteſt, in which the enemy can be repelled only by being entirely ſubdued, and which admits of no ſafety but in his extermination. But regular Governments lie under peculiar diſadvantages, in a ſtruggle with ſo wild, ferocious, and deſperate a Power, as they have now to contend with. They cannot employ the ſame means, nor command the ſame reſources, as their adverſary. They muſt, in carrying on the War, huſband the lives, and reſpect the property, the occupations, and the future happineſs of their ſubjects; while he, regardleſs

gardleſs of ſuch conſiderations, puts every thing in requiſition, devotes the perſons, property, and induſtry of twenty-four millions of people to the ſole purpoſes of the War; and, in order to prolong, for a ſhort time, his uſurped dominion, ſacrifices, without ſcruple or remorſe, the laſting intereſts of his country. This diſparity is further augmented by the inducements which one party is under, as well from principle and habit, as from motives of permanent and ſubſtantial policy, to adhere to the obligations preſcribed by the laws of probity, honour, humanity, and civilization; while the other throws off all ſuch reſtraints, and makes the moſt atrocious perfidy, the moſt ſavage cruelty, and a thorough contempt of every eſtabliſhed rule, of every humane and generous impulſe, and of every law divine and human, ſubſervient to its horrid and infernal ſyſtem.

To counterbalance theſe comparative diſadvantages, it behoves the Combined Powers to rouſe themſelves to unprecedented exertions in the cauſe of Society and Humanity. Every Sovereign engaged in that cauſe is called upon, by the moſt ſolemn mandates of duty and conſcience, to employ the powers, and apply the reſources, entruſted to him by Providence for the good of his people, with the greateſt poſſible degree of vigour and energy. Never were the duties of Government ſo various, ſo important, or ſo arduous, as

at

at the preſent moment. Extreme vigilance is as neceſſary as the utmoſt exertion. The dangers that are concealed exceed, if poſſible, thoſe that are manifeſt. The aſtoniſhing force, the furious efforts, openly employed to render the cauſe of Anarchy univerſally triumphant, are even leſs to be dreaded than the baſe and deteſtable means, ſecretly reſorted to for the ſame purpoſe. The patrons of *that* cauſe, the uſurping demagogues of France, place their chief dependence on Seduction, Treachery, Conſpiracy, and Inſurrection; theſe are their main reſources, on which they rely for ſucceſs, even more than on the countleſs numbers, the inexhauſtible maſs, which, by the terror of the Guillotine, they drive into the field. They have in every State their hireling emiſſaries, ſent there to inflame, to ſeduce, and to betray; to create reſtleſſneſs, inſubordination, and diſaffection; and to improve every occaſion for exciting diſturbance and commotion. But what is, perhaps, ſtill more alarming, though at the ſame time almoſt beyond credibility, they are powerfully aided, in their nefarious projects, by a conſiderable portion of every State; they find every where a numerous party, who, with an infatuation amounting to inſanity, are ready to co-operate in the dreadful work of univerſal deſtruction.

THIS party is compoſed of a great variety of characters, who ſeem to differ exceedingly in their principles and views; they perform very different parts, and often without any apparent connection, in the tragical Drama; but they all advance by a real, though, perhaps, an imperceptible combination, the ſhocking Cataſtrophe. Whether, as deſperate conſpirators, they plot the ſubverſion of the Government to which they owe allegiance, or, as raſh innovators and ſpeculative reformers, they expoſe it to the ſame danger;—whether they employ themſelves in promulgating democratical principles, jacobinical doctrines, and revolutionary ſyſtems, or are content with encouraging every effort of ſedition, and with impeding, by a factious oppoſition, every meaſure of vigour and efficacy—they equally conduce to the ſucceſs of the enemy, by contributing to damp the ardour; to excite the deſpondency, to embarraſs the government, and to palſy the efforts of their Country. Who will venture to aſſert that France is without allies, when ſuch numbers are every where inceſſantly labouring in her behalf? Where elſe could ſhe have found ſuch valuable alliances? Who could ſo effectually favour her attack as thoſe who looſen the ties of Society, when its preſervation requires thoſe ties to be drawn cloſer than ever? The Grecians had never laid Troy in aſhes, if the fatal horſe had not found an entrance within the walls of that city;

yet Troy bred no degenerate Citizens to combine with her enemies, and conſpire her deſtruction. Enviable City—though a prey to fraud and artifice, thou didſt not find traitors among thy own children! *Heu priſca fides!*

But now that modern philoſophy, the rights of man, and their hideous offspring, Jacobiniſm, have opened new ſources of deſtruction, and, by diſſolving the bonds which conſtitute the ſocial union, ſeek to involve the world in a Chaos incomparably worſe than that, from which it originally emerged—in a ſeaſon of ſuch extreme and complicated danger, the Government that confines itſelf to ordinary exertions, or to ordinary vigilance, is acceſſary to its own ruin, and anſwerable for all the conſequences, by which that ruin may be followed. Every Government is bound, at ſuch a moment, not merely to ſtrain every nerve, but to enjoin itſelf unremitting watchfulneſs. It ſhould be all eye, all ear—to guard againſt ſurprize, and to detect the deſperate and crafty deſigns of its numberleſs enemies. It ſhould be ſtrengthened in proportion to the magnitude and the importance of its duty. The moſt urgent neceſſity decrees it to provide—*ne quid reſpublica detrimenti capiat.* All ſincere and rational friends to liberty will joyfully ſubmit to any reſtraints and ſacrifices, which may be neceſſary for the preſervation of that order and ſecurity, with-

without which genuine and ſalutary freedom cannot exiſt: and they will be eager to ſtrengthen the hands of Government, and to rally round their natural protectors, if the latter will ſet them the example of firmneſs, reſolution, and intrepidity.

It is alſo neceſſary, at ſuch a time, to invigorate the laws, to enforce them with the utmoſt rigour, and to arm juſtice, with all its terrors, againſt thoſe, who conſpire to diſturb the public tranquillity, or who ſeek to cultivate a ſpirit of diſaffection to lawful authority. When examples are neceſſary to awe and intimidate, liberality and lenity are ill-timed, and would probably be fatal. Severity is humanity, when mercy and forbearance would be cruelty to the State. Nor is it an object of trifling moment (indeed nothing can be trifling at ſuch a conjuncture), to exerciſe the greateſt caution and diſcernment in the choice of the perſons, who are ſelected to be, in any degree, the depoſitaries of public truſt. When every department ſhould be ſignalized for ardour, alacrity, and diſpatch—when apathy is a crime no leſs fatal in its tendency than actual treachery—none are deſerving of confidence but thoſe, who are diſtinguiſhed by their zeal and conſiſtency, as well as by their rectitude and abilities. Whoever, at ſuch a time, has a function, is reſponſible to the whole world, and to poſterity, for the exerciſe of his truſt. But who

who is there at ſuch a time without a function? Who ſhall be ſupine and inactive, when the exiſtence of Society is at ſtake? The Bad have all their functions, and they ſet an example of diligence and perſeverance, which would do honour to the nobleſt cauſe. And ſhall the Good be diſgraced by the compariſon? Shall they, whoſe object it is to preſerve whatever is dear or valuable to ſocial man, be out-done in firmneſs, ſpirit, or activity, by thoſe, whoſe aim is anarchy and univerſal ruin? Shall the call of loyalty, honour, and independence, be leſs forcible than that of Republican tyranny? or, Shall the energy inſpired by a genuine attachment to one's country, and heightened by every ſocial and benevolent feeling, be eclipſed by the compulſory efforts extorted by cruelty, oppreſſion, and terror? Government, with all its aſſiduity, requires extraordinary ſupport and aſſiſtance. The people muſt aid themſelves, and co-operate in their own cauſe. There is no one, whatever his ſtation may be, whoſe ſervices are not important. Whoever promotes union and energy—whoever, by his own example, inſpires his neighbour with zeal and animation, or by his vigilance detects and brings to light the machinations of domeſtic traitors—every ſuch perſon gives vigour to Government, and contributes that kind of aid, which the criſis particularly demands. On the other hand,

hand, whoever omits or delays any thing in his power, that can be ſerviceable to the general cauſe, is a traitor to Humanity, and deſerves to find, from woful experience, that his folly is equal to his crime*

THE

* The fatal effects of remiſſneſs, on the part of the People, to co-operate with their Government, in furniſhing ſuch extraordinary aſſiſtance as the emergency requires, are forcibly exemplified in the preſent ſituation of the inhabitants of the Auſtrian Netherlands. Theſe infatuated people, forgetful of the hardſhips they ſuffered during the invaſion of Dumourier, were deaf to the calls of their Sovereign, who warned them, that without their own endeavours, his hereditary forces, diminiſhed and exhauſted by the length and ſeverity of their ſervices, would be unequal to their defence againſt the maſs, which the enemy was pouring forth to overwhelm them. (See the Addreſs of the Emperor of Germany to the Inhabitants of the Netherlands, dated Tournay, May 6, 1794.) The warning was neglected; and theſe wretched people now reap the fruits of their inertneſs, in the moſt grievous exactions—in the ſpoliation of their property—in the requiſition of their perſons—in the tranſportation of their ſpecie, grain, and moſt valuable effects, to France—and, in ſhort, in the tyranny of the Guillotine. They are obliged to fight the battles of their enemies, becauſe they would not fight their own—and the Republican armies are ſupplied with 100,000 men from the country, which would not raiſe the neceſſary levies to defend itſelf. It would be weakneſs rather than humanity to feel an emotion of pity for ſufferings ſo juſtly merited. With the aid of ſuch an example, it is to be hoped that the Manifeſto of the Prince of Cobourg to the Germanic Nation, and the propoſitions of the Prince of Orange to the States-General, will have their due effect. The wonder is, that

THE ſame urgent neceſſity which calls upon every Government to diſplay all its energy, and upon every people to contribute, collectively and individually, their utmoſt efforts in aid of the common cauſe, requires alſo, that the Sovereigns, engaged therein, ſhould employ their united force to the beſt advantage, and in a manner likely to produce the greateſt poſſible effect. The diſadvantages, which generally attend the operations of Allied Powers, are too well known, and unfortunately, at this time, are too ſenſibly felt, to need any illuſtration. It is worthy of the occaſion, which has produced ſo remarkable a Coalition, to animate it with one ſoul. There exiſts a perfect identity of intereſt—there ſhould likewiſe exiſt unity of deſign, conformity of ſyſtem, and concert in operation. It is impoſſible to ſuppoſe, that any one of theſe Powers can loſe ſight, for a moment, of the common object, or forget that there can be no ſecurity, unleſs the Jacobin ſyſtem be intirely deſtroyed, and that ſpeedily; but it deſerves very ſerious conſideration, whether the uſual modes of intercourſe can ſuffice, for that cloſe and intimate communication, for that thorough mutual underſtanding, and for that celerity of co-operation, which the nature of the

that manifeſtoes and propoſitions, which, however forcible, are vapid when compared to the language of events, ſhould be requiſite to rouſe any people to a ſenſe of their danger and of their duty.

War

War particularly requires, and without which, with the beſt poſſible diſpoſitions, the Allies may fail to ſupport each other. The locality of their reſpective ſituations is extremely unfavourable to their diſcuſſing and arranging, upon a mutual expoſition of their views and reſources, even their general ſyſtem of Warfare; but it is abundantly more ſo to their acting in uniſon, upon unexpected occurrences, whether of a favourable or diſaſtrous nature. The ſwiftneſs of the Courier's flight, from Cabinet to Cabinet, is outſtripped by the more rapid whirl of events, and the contents of his diſpatches become obſolete, before they can arrive at the places of their deſtination. Hence the wiſeſt plans loſe their effect by being always too late, and the Revolution continues to exiſt by having conſtantly the ſtart of the meaſures taken for its deſtruction.

It merits conſideration, whether theſe inconveniences might not, in a great meaſure, be obviated, by the eſtabliſhment of a Permanent Council in the vicinity of the principal Armies. If there really exiſt among the Combined Powers that harmony and confidence, which nothing but a blindneſs to their common intereſt can prevent, ſuch a Council might have the effect of concentrating their force, and of giving the advantage of unity to the moſt extenſive Confederacy the world ever ſaw. But, at all events, if the

Envoys at ſuch a Council, were to act merely as the organs of communication, between their reſpective Courts and Armies, it is obvious that the important object of diſpatch would be promoted, and meaſures, by being more ſeaſonable, would have an infinitely better chance of being ſucceſsful. Nothing that is practicable ſhould be omitted to prevent the loſs of a moment, when on the immediate improvement of an advantage, or on the inſtantaneous ſeizure of an occaſion, may depend the fate not only of the preſent age, but of generations yet unborn. The detail of military operations would, perpaps, be moſt advantageouſly referred to the collective judgment of thoſe General Officers, who preſide over the reſpective Armies, and who, being in conſtant correſpondence with the Diplomatic Council, might the better concert their enterprizes with a reference both to the general ſyſtem, and to the reſources on which they might depend to carry them into execution.

But the meaſure which promiſes to be the moſt efficacious, in rendering the War ſpeedily and completely ſucceſsful, is pointed out by the actual ſituation of the French People. The malady itſelf, if attentively conſidered, indicates the remedy. The real cauſe of the immenſe obſtacles which impede the accompliſhment of our object,

object, and which render it as arduous as it is indiſpenſable, may be found in that unprecedented and almoſt inconceivable ſyſtem of tyranny and terror, by which the rulers of France have enabled themſelves to diſpoſe arbitrarily of that miſerable country. Under the influence, and by the operation, of Revolutionary principles, they have reduced France to a ſtate of ſubjection and dependence, of which Society has never before witneſſed an example. In the name of the People, and under the pretended authority of the Nation, they wind up conſtraint to its higheſt pitch, and practiſe a degree of compulſion, which no regular Government, profeſſedly exerciſing its powers in its own right, however arbitrary its form, could poſſibly enforce. By the influence of cruelty and intimidation, they have ſubdued the minds and broken the ſpirits of the people, and have obtained the intire command and direction of all the force, both phyſical and moral, of the country. Every voice and every arm are at the command of the fell Tyrants, who rule over the nominal Republic. Thus, while in reality no kind of union exiſts, the effects of the moſt perfect union are attained; and the moſt adverſe are glad, not merely to conceal their repugnance, but even to feign an attachment and a devotion to a cauſe which they deteſt. In that land of pretended liberty, no one dares to complain—all are obliged to approve—to applaud—to promote—

what in their hearts they abhor. To avoid ſuſpicion is the predominant wiſh, for from ſuſpicion to deſtruction the paſſage is known to be ſhort. No combination can be formed againſt ſuch a ſyſtem of tyranny, for all confidence and all freedom of communication are at an end. The people at large have neither intereſt nor influence in the ſtruggles for ſupremacy; whatever faction prevails, *their* ſituation is preciſely the ſame, and they are always ready to ſignify their acquieſcence, by crying, *Vive la Republique*. The convulſions attending ſuch ſtruggles do not extend to them, but are confined to the little circle occupied by the egregious monſters, who, by their extraordinary vices and deſperation, have advanced themſelves to a ſituation to diſpute the anarchical ſceptre. Such conteſts, indeed, frequently occur; but as they are prepared in dark and ſilent obſcurity, conducted by cabal and intrigue, and decided, the very moment they explode, by the quick proceſs of the Guillotine, ever in the hands of the ſtrongeſt party, the ſhock is ſcarcely felt, and the miſerable people, far from having an opportunity afforded them of attempting their deliverance, paſs over from one tyrant, or ſet of tyrants, to another, with as little privity and participation as the cattle in the fields.

To ſuppoſe that ſuch a ſtate of things can fail to be, in the greateſt poſſible degree, odious and

irkſome to thoſe who are obliged to ſubmit to it, would be to ſet at defiance every ſuggeſtion both of reaſon and experience.—To doubt that the French People are impatient to throw off ſo grievous and galling a yoke, and to inflict a ſignal vengeance on their ſanguinary Tyrants, would be to doubt that they are men, or that they poſſeſs the moſt common feelings of humanity. The reign of deluſion is over, and is ſucceeded by that of terror. It is not in the power of the Conventional declaimers, by all their harangues about liberty, patriotiſm, juſtice, and humanity, to convince the people that they are free—that their tyrants are humane—that the Revolutionary Tribunal is juſt—or the Guillotine merciful. Such profeſſions, indeed, facilitate the execution of the moſt oppreſſive meaſures, becauſe tyranny is arrived at ſuch a pitch, that nobody dares to contradict them; and under the cover of a deep and gloomy ſilence, which it would be death to break, the moſt falſe and inſulting pretexts ſeem to poſſeſs the ſemblance of ſincerity and the ſanction of general acquieſcence. But the unceaſing proceſſions to the ſcaffold, and the conſciouſneſs of each individual that he may be led there in an inſtant, muſt repel all the arts of deluſion, and convince every one of the real nature of his ſituation.

It is juſt, therefore, to conclude, that, whatever impatience is felt by the friends of order, throughout Europe, for the deſtruction of the ſyſtem now prevailing in France, it muſt fall vaſtly ſhort of that which is experienced by the French people themſelves. What to us is danger, to them is ſuffering:—what we only dread, they actually endure. But ſubject to this difference, the cauſe is the ſame. We cannot eſcape without their being reſcued; nor can their deliverance be much longer delayed, without our incurring the imminent riſk, if not the abſolute certainty, of ſharing their fate. Organized as a Military Republic, of which the only cement is fear, they are compelled to rivet their own chains, and to reſiſt the endeavours uſed for their emancipation. Obliged to be their own enemies, and *that* without daring to repine, it cannot excite ſurprize that they ſhould be ours alſo. But every conſideration of mutual intereſt and of general policy points them out as our natural allies, in ſuch a conteſt, and calls upon us to gain their confidence, to ſecure their aſſiſtance, and, by furniſhing them with timely and effectual ſuccour, to enable them to co-operate with us againſt the common foe. Unaided by their extorted efforts, their tyrants would ceaſe to be formidable; and every ſtruggle they can be induced to make in their own favour is valuable, not only as it furniſhes an important aid to the operations of the Allies, but ſtill more ſo as it ſhakes the edifice of

Jaco-

Jacobinical Deſpotiſm to its very foundations. A powerful body of ſuch troops, well armed and provided, and in a ſituation to reciprocate exertions with the forces of the Combined Powers, would give the Conventional Monſters more juſt cauſe for alarm*, than the whole confederacy of Monarchs, deſtitute of ſuch aſſiſtance; and would aid the cauſe of Order and Government, more than the baſe, avaricious, and *felo de ſe* neutrality of the other States can injure it.

Nor ſhould it be forgotten, that it is only from ſuch troops, that we can expect the kind of warfare, which would put both parties on a footing. The Allies cannot, and would not if they could, adopt that mercileſs and barbarous ſyſtem of hoſtilities, by which their worſe than ſavage foe is diſtinguiſhed. But if a conſiderable part of the French nation ſhould riſe in arms, they muſt, from neceſſity, be as deſperate and as furious as their opponents. Engaged in a civil war, they can neither give nor expect quar-

* Le Comte de Montgaillard, in his "*Etat de la France* "*au Mois du Mai* 1794," ſays, that the war ſupported by the Royaliſts in the *Vendée* inſpired terror into the hearts of the Tyrants, and filled the Aſſembly with conſternation.—And this writer alſo aſſerts, that it coſt the Republic above 200,000 men and 900 millions of livres to ſtop the progreſs of ſo alarming a war. He adds, that the *Vendée* has been the only terror of the Convention, who conſidered it as the *real* danger of the Republic. p. 33, 34.

ter—they muſt render themſelves formidable, as well by terror as by ſtrength, and thereby eſtabliſh a counterpoiſe to the dread, which operates ſo forcibly on the minds of their countrymen. Nay, in them it will be a virtue to ſteel their boſoms againſt all emotions of pity, in purſuing their juſt vengeance againſt their unfeeling deſpots—the regicides of their King—the murderers of their friends and relatives.

It is, therefore, an object of the moſt obvious expedience, as well as of the moſt preſſing neceſſity, to furniſh, if poſſible, an opportunity to the people of France, to exert themſelves in working their own deliverance. It is by ſuch means that the operations of the Allied Armies would be moſt effectually ſupported, and that a powerful diverſion might be produced, to diſtract the attention of the Republican forces; until, at length, the loyal party ſhould acquire a ſufficient degree of ſtrength and conſiſtency, to give confidence to their numberleſs, though ſecret well-wiſhers; who then, with ſudden and irreſiſtible fury, would ruſh forth and burſt their galling chains. Then would the ſpell which binds all France, as it were, by enchantment, be broken in an inſtant—then would the immenſe and tremendous edifice, reared by Guilt and Artifice, and ſeeming to defy the united attacks of the whole world, vaniſh into air—and the vile impoſtors, who hold

a vaſt

a vaſt nation in abject thraldom, and who wave their terrific wand over the earth, would appear in their native impotence and deformity, expoſed, defenceleſs, to the uplifted hand of Juſtice.

To bring about an event ſo tranſporting, even in idea, to every humane mind—to accelerate *a conſummation ſo devoutly to be wiſhed*, it behoves the Combined Powers to watch and improve every favourable opportunity, for aſſiſting the French people to throw off their yoke. It is for want of ſuch aſſiſtance that ſo many efforts, made by them for that purpoſe, have proved abortive. The gallant party in LA VENDEE, though deplorably diminiſhed by battles and executions, ſtill keeps alive the precious embers, from which, if fanned by timely and adequate ſuccour, may yet proceed a flame that ſhall conſume the regicides, and revivify France with the genial warmth of Loyalty and Religion.

BUT in order to render their proffered ſuccour acceptable, the Powers at war with France will find it neceſſary to gain the confidence of thoſe, whom they mean to aſſiſt, by making a full and explicit DECLARATION of their views and intentions. Until then, their conduct, however friendly and honourable, will be enveloped in a chilling miſt of uncertainty; and Republican artifice will continue to take advantage of that circumſtance, by repre-

repreſenting them as ſeeking to gratify their own ambition, and to conquer or diſmember France, rather than to deliver it *. Thus will the people

* The arts of Jacobin deluſion, which can have no effect in deceiving the people as to their internal ſituation, are moſt ſucceſsfully practiſed in deceiving them reſpecting the intentions of the Allies. The Count de Montgaillard repreſents the Convention and the Jacobins as endeavouring to perſuade the people and the armies, "that Europe is at war with the "French Monarchy as well as with the Jacobins, with the "Royaliſts as well as with the *Sans Culottes*, with the terri-"tory as well as with principles; that the diſmemberment "of France is the object of the War; that the Clergy and "the Nobleſſe are not at all conſidered in the ſucceſſive "adheſion of Cabinets to the *general cauſe of Government*; "and that the indifference of thoſe Cabinets for the Houſe "of Bourbon, would, in any caſe, enable France to "terminate the War to her advantage by means of ſacri-"fices." In ſupport of ſuch aſſertions, the Rulers of that Country are ſtated, by the ſame writer, to avail themſelves of the following reaſoning, which, to the French people (at leaſt) muſt appear incontrovertible: "That if theſe were not the projects of the Belligerent "Powers, they would have granted to the Royaliſts the "Proclamation of their King, and the preciſe communica-"tion of their intentions in his favour; that they would "have guaranteed to France, in the moſt expreſs manner, "her MONARCHICAL FORMS, her property, and her rights; "that they would, at length, have explained their long "ſilence, which authorizes every fear, which juſtifies every "ſuſpicion, and which provokes ſuch powerful reſiſtance; "in ſhort, that they would have opened that Treaty of "Peace, which was to be preſented or impoſed on a great "Nation."

be

be diſpoſed to ſubmit to any thing, rather than unite with Foreign Powers to give themſelves a new Maſter, or to ſacrifice, what no diſtreſs can induce a people to diſregard, the Independence of their country.

If, then, the Confederated States of Europe would ſecure the benefit of that aſſiſtance, without which, if we judge from paſt experience, they may finally fail to reſtore their own ſecurity, and even to preſerve their exiſtence, they muſt convince the French Nation, that inſtead of purſuing the War from motives of ambition and conqueſt, their real object is to preſerve and ſecure the bleſſings of Civilized Society and of regular Government; and that, ſhould they ſucceed in overthrowing the preſent Tyranny of France, they would not attempt to ſubſtitute a Foreign Dominion in its ſtead, or even to eſtabliſh an external influence, incompatible with the Independence of the country. Inſtead, however, of confining themſelves to Declarations, they will find it neceſſary to confirm thoſe Declarations by correſpondent meaſures; without which their aſſurances, however poſitive, will fail to attract confidence, and their interference will appear to be produced by intereſted motives. How can they be ſuppoſed to mean the Reſtoration of the French Monarchy, unleſs they recognize the title of the Prince, on whom the right to the Crown has devolved, according

cording to the fundamental principles of that Monarchy? All the Potentates of Europe are loudly called upon, for their own preſervation, to acknowledge this title, and to engage, *at all events*, to ſupport it; and all perſons who wiſh to avoid the horrors of anarchy, and to retain the advantages produced by regular and permanent Government, muſt be impatient to witneſs ſuch a recognition. What then but that crooked and ſiniſter policy, which reſerves itſelf to take an unfair advantage of contingencies, can delay a meaſure ſo clearly dictated both by policy and juſtice?

It is not, however, a Declaration in favour of Louis XVII. as the lawful King of France, which would, alone, be ſufficient evidence that the intentions of the Allies are honourable. It is as Heir and Repreſentative of the French Monarchy that his title is derived, and as ſuch only it ſhould be acknowledged. By ſeparating the Monarch form the Monarchy, the father was made the victim of domeſtic faction—and, by the ſame means, the ſon might be made the tool of foreign intrigue and influence. His claim muſt, therefore, be recognized in its relation to the ancient Monarchy, unmixed with any Revolutionary leaven, as well as unaccompanied with any fanciful modifications. Every Frenchman who feels properly for the honour of his country, and for his own con-

conſequence as a member of an Independent State, would not only diſdain the offer of any other form of Government than that, under which France has been wont to maintain its national dignity and independence, but he would alſo view, with jealouſy and ſuſpicion, every attempt to clog the reſtoration of that Monarchy with novel reſtrictions or limitations. However anxious he may be for the return of order and tranquillity to his native land, he would renounce that land for ever, rather than live there under a Government, framed or modelled by ſtrangers: and he would juſtly conſider every pretence, however ſpecious, to alter or qualify a Government, which is intitled to his allegiance, not merely as tending to prolong anarchy, and to engender diſſention, but as incompatible with the nature and rights of an Independent State, in which all modifications muſt be the ſole reſult of internal regulations *.

To

* The faction known by the name of Conſtitutionaliſts, whoſe vanity is not diminiſhed either by the misfortunes they have ſuffered themſelves, or, which is infinitely more important, by thoſe they have brought on their Country, ſeem ſtill to indulge the preſumptuous hope, that the Allies, or at leaſt Great Britain, will be diſpoſed to ſet up again their miſ-ſhapen, unnatural, and impracticable Conſtitution of 1789; and it is ſaid, that they employ all the arts of intrigue to effect that purpoſe. Theſe men, on whom experience is entirely thrown away, are not only enemies to the future peace, but alſo traitors to the independence, of their country.

To acquire the confidence, and engage the co-operation, of the French People, the Sovereigns of Europe muſt, therefore, diſclaim all right, not only of impoſing a new Government on France, but alſo of modifying or limiting the ancient one; and they muſt ſhew that their interference in the domeſtic affairs of that country, is founded and conducted upon the principle, that although obliged to reſtore, they do not conſider themſelves intitled to regulate *. For this purpoſe,

country. But can they imagine that the Combined Powers will furniſh them with an opportunity of doing further miſchief? It is ſurely enough to have let them go on, for once, without interruption, until they blew up a flame, which threatens all Europe with deſtruction; and ſhould that flame be happily got under (which after five years remains a matter of immenſe difficulty), no one who does not wiſh for a general conflagration, would put another torch into ſuch hands. Nor can the people of France be ſuppoſed to be mad enough to wiſh again for guides, who have already led them into the abyſs of ruin.

* The author has elſewhere undertaken to eſtabliſh, that the interference of the Combined Powers in the domeſtic affairs of France, inſtead of being an unjuſt or officious intermeddling, is dictated by abſolute neceſſity, with a view to general ſecurity; that it is juſtified by the Law of Nations; and that, if applied ſolely to the reſtoration of the French Monarchy, it is not only conſiſtent with, but indiſpenſably neceſſary to, the freedom and independence of France, and of every other State. See Objections to the Continuance of the War Examined and Refuted. See *ante*, p. 148.

while

while they acknowledge the title of the lawful Monarch, they ſhould be careful not to forget the ancient and eſſential appendages of his Crown. In vain would they hope to gain credit for their profeſſed intentions to fix that Crown on the infant head, on which it has rightfully deſcended, unleſs they alſo acknowldge as Regent, the Prince, whom the forms of the Monarchy deſignate, as intitled to that important and neceſſary office; and unleſs they accompany the declaration of his right, with an inveſtiture of his political character. By treating him, at the head of his Council, as a Sovereign Prince, authorized to make engagements for the country which he repreſents, the Combined Powers would give the moſt ſatisfactory evidence to the French Nation, that their intentions are perfectly honourable.

In like manner the other Princes of the Blood Royal are, by virtue of their connection with the Crown which, for the ſecurity of Europe, it is found neceſſary to reſtore, intitled to every mark of attention and reſpect, which they were formerly accuſtomed to receive in foreign countries. Every ſuch teſtimonial paid to theſe illuſtrious exiles is, in reality, beſtowed on the cauſe of Royalty, Order, and regular Government, and cannot fail to operate powerfully on a

Nation, diſtinguiſhed for a characteriſtic attachment to its Princes.

A SIMILAR policy ſeems to require, that the wrecks of the Clergy and Nobility of France ſhould be carefully gathered up and preſerved, wherever they have been caſt by the tempeſtuous fury of the Revolution. Theſe Orders formed an eſſential part of the ancient Monarchy; and in re-conſtructing the venerable edifice they are of indiſpenſable neceſſity. In the great work of reſtoring every thing to its proper place, and of re-eſtabliſhing order and harmony, how important is it to preſerve, in the greateſt poſſible perfection, the ſolid materials, which, being fitted to each other, have for ages conſtituted the ſtrength, and preſerved the ſymmetry of the ſtructure!

Theſe great bodies are not, however, to be conſidered merely as component orders of the State, inſeparable from the Monarchy, but alſo as neceſſary, by the reſpective ſervices which they are qualified to perform, to aſſiſt in bringing about and eſtabliſhing that change in the political and moral condition of France, which is neceſſary for the future repoſe of Europe. In the Emigrant Nobility may be found the *ſtamina* of the military force, the ancient and natural defence of the French Monarchy. Bred up, moſtly, to

to the profeſſion of arms, and eager to expoſe their lives in the cauſe of their Sovereign and their Country, the intereſt of every Sovereign, and of every Country, requires that their ardour ſhould be gratified. The ſervices they may render are not to be computed merely from the probable effects of their well-known valour, ſtimulated to the greateſt poſſible degree of enthuſiaſm, by a ſenſe of their injuries, by the ſufferings and perils of all they hold dear in France, and by the magnitude of their collective and individual intereſts, depending on the iſſue of the conteſt. They may be rendered even more uſeful by their example than by their proweſs. While they fight under foreign colours, they aſſiſt only by their numbers and their bravery; but led to action by their gallant Princes, and unfurling their ancient banners, they would excite the confidence, and kindle the loyalty of their countrymen; who would flock to a ſtandard, under which they might, with certainty, enliſt in the ſervice of their King, and fight for the deliverance, without fearing to wound the independence of their country*. Thus would the Republican

* It is a fact extremely well authenticated, that on the 18th of laſt June, upon a *rencontre* between a party of French Huſſars in the ſervice of the Emperor, and, of courſe, wearing a black cockade, and ſome Republican Dragoons, the latter cried out, that they would not fight with ſuch

publican Armies experience a defection, which, at preſent, is not more impeded by vigilance and ſeverity, than by the uncertainty which prevails reſpecting the views of the Combined Powers, and the miſrepreſentations to which that uncertainty gives occaſion: and deſertion being ſanctioned by honour, and by the impulſe of thoſe local attachments which are natural to the human breaſt, the ſucceſſes of the ſtandard would probably exceed thoſe of the ſword*.

THE

brave fellows. Inſtantly the ſabres were mutually ſheathed, and the Royaliſts, ſeeing their countrymen ſo well diſpoſed, aſked them why they did not paſs over. To which the others replied, "*Le pouvons nous avec honneur, vu la cocarde que vous portez?*"—How can we with honour, when you wear ſuch a "cockade?"—Whereupon they ſeparated, crying together, *Vive le Roi*.

* The plan adopted by the Government of Great Britain, of employing French Emigrant Officers at the head of their countrymen, diſtinguiſhed by the *inſignia* of their ancient ſervice, is ſo admirably calculated to produce the happieſt effects, that it deſerves conſideration whether that plan may not be beneficially extended. Theſe brave and loyal men deſire nothing more than to be furniſhed with an opportunity of ſerving a cauſe, in which they have a more *immediate*, though not a deeper intereſt than ourſelves; and they conſider a ſtate of inaction, at ſuch a time, almoſt as the ſevereſt of their misfortunes. It is impoſſible to engage too many of them, provided ſuch only be confided in as have maintained the character of pure Royaliſts, and have not aſſiſted in the criminal and ruinous work

The French Clergy cannot, indeed, be rendered inſtrumental to the ſucceſs of military operations, but hereafter they may be of unſpeakable

work of the Revolution. It may deſerve conſideration, whether they might not be employed to the greateſt advantage, and in a manner particularly conſonant to the nature and object of the War, by forming, through their means, and as far as circumſtances will allow, the army to which they formerly belonged; which being thus reſtored, though in *epitome*, might be moſt uſefully employed in aid of the common cauſe. It is conceived, that this might eaſily be done by convening the ſurviving Officers of that Army, and arranging them in the new corps, which it may be propoſed to raiſe, by a reference to their former rank, to be aſcertained by the Military Calendar of 1789. Thus no one would find himelf out of his place in reſpect of another, nor would any one have reaſon to complain of his particular ſituation, however low, when allotted him, not by partiality, intrigue, or caprice, but by the application of a juſt and general principle.

Perhaps alſo ſuch a plan might contribute to advantages, beyond the promotion of the ſucceſs of the War; for upon the reſtoration of lawful Government in France, it would be extremely conducive to the preſervation of order, and the ſuppreſſion of thoſe commotions which cannot be expected to ſubſide, at once, after ſo long and violent an agitation, for the Sovereign to find his regular army ſo far organized, that he might, with eaſe and expedition, reſtore it to its ancient footing. And it is alſo conceived, that by the application of this principle, the French Officers would be enabled, with greater facility, to recruit among their countrymen, who ſhould have the good fortune to eſcape from their oppreſſors.

utility in promoting and ſecuring the ultimate object of thoſe operations. At the important moment when France ſhall again receive her exiled and wandering children into her boſom—when an opportunity ſhall preſent itſelf for a return of order and tranquillity—how valuable will be the labours of thoſe venerable Paſtors, who have, through the whole Revolution, maintained inviolate their faith and their principles—who have not bent the knee to Baal, nor taken an oath incompatible with their conſciences—who have, with unexampled meekneſs and conſtancy, ſuffered a perſecution more cruel and relentleſs than is recorded in the annals, even of the moſt barbarous ages—and who, eſcaping from the jaws of death, from the butchery, of which multitudes of their conſcientious brethren were victims, fled, deſtitute and forlorn, to foreign climes;—where, by the invariable tenor of their behaviour, they have attracted univerſal eſteem, and exhibited, in the depths of adverſity, a brilliant example of Chriſtian piety and reſignation *. How affecting would be

* It is a fact, that a French Gentleman, who laſt year effected his eſcape from his unfortunate country, found that the beſt diſguiſe he could aſſume to favour that eſcape, through ſome of the villages in Artois and Flanders, was the character of a Prieſt; and the villagers were not only diſpoſed, even at ſome riſk, to furniſh him with all the aſſiſtance in their power, but ſome of them offered him money to

be their re-union to their ancient flocks! how powerful would be the impulſe of renewed attachment, and of veneration for their ſacred functions, heightened by a recollection of their ſufferings, their firmneſs, and conſiſtency!—and how uſeful would be their influence, in reclaiming the perverted, in bringing back the miſled to the paths of religion, virtue, and civil ſubordination—and, above all, in counteracting thoſe baneful effects, which the habitual licentiouſneſs, and unbridled exceſſes of five years, cannot fail to have produced upon a country, ſtill containing above twenty millions of *human* beings.

UPON the whole, whatever has a tendency to accelerate the re-eſtabliſhment of the lawful Government of France, is eſſentially connected with the object of the preſent War, *the reſtoration of* GENERAL SECURITY. Until the above event be accompliſhed, the pernicious ſyſtem, which threatens mankind with devaſtation, can never be truly ſaid to be exterminated. Like a camelion, it may change its hues, but it will continue to exiſt and to deſtroy. Until the firm eſtabliſhment of that Government in France, which time and expe-

to officiate privately in their religious ceremonies. And it is aſſerted, by the author of *Raſſurez vous*, that there are few peaſants in France, who have not purchaſed and concealed a portrait of Louis XVI. and a Copy of his Will.

ſience (the only ſafe teſts in ſuch matters), have proved to be alone calculated for duration in that country, Revolution will follow Revolution—ſucceſſive factions will gain the aſcendancy by furious conteſt and bloody victory—all perſons, who ſeek to agitate and convulſe other States will, purſue, with increaſing activity, their deſperate projects—and anarchy will be conſtantly endeavouring to draw other countries into its deſtructive vortex.

The moſt brilliant victories, the moſt complete ſucceſſes, of the Combined Arms will produce no real benefit to mankind, unleſs they have the effect of reinſtating that lawful authority, the ſubverſion of which has endangered every kind of lawful authority, political, moral, and religious. The blood and treaſure ſo copiouſly, though unavoidably, expended, will be thrown away, unleſs they conduce to terminate the French Revolution, in a manner that ſhall convince the factious, the turbulent, and the perverſe, of every deſcription, that although diſloyalty and ſedition may, under the ſpecious covering of falſe metaphyſical rights, involve a country in extreme guilt, wretchedneſs, and confuſion, it is impoſſible for them ultimately to prevail.

If, on the contrary, the Coaleſced Powers, forgetful that *the cauſe of the French Monarchy, attacked as it is by principles ſubverſive of all ſocial*

*ſocial order, is the cauſe of every Government and of every country*—if, loſing ſight of this important truth, which they were ſo unaccountably ſlow in diſcovering, they ſhould ſuffer the Revolutionary ſyſtem to eſtabliſh itſelf in *any form*—they would, after a momentary and illuſory peace, be the victims of their own folly:—they would contribute to ſap the foundations of civil ſociety, by giving their ſanction to the pretended right of inſurrection, and to the whole Revolutionary Code of Modern Philoſophy. The principle of ſubverſion, being thus recognized, would expand itſelf, with incredible velocity, to other countries; and, in a very few years, neither the Throne of a lawful Sovereign, nor a Temple of the true God, would be found in any part of Europe.

9 DE 63

# FARTHER REFLECTIONS

SUBMITTED TO THE

# CONSIDERATION

OF THE

# *COMBINED POWERS.*

SI PATRIAM—PARENTES—ANTIQUA MALLENT, QUAM DOMINOS. . . TACIT.

PUBLISHED IN DECEMBER,

1794.

BRITISH MUSEUM

## ADVERTISEMENT.

THE object of the following REFLECTIONS, is not to indulge a fruitleſs and unavailing alarm, but to ſuggeſt a *ſpecific* plan for the reſtoration of general ſecurity, and the preſervation of the civil rights of mankind. Thoſe who object to this ſyſtem, ſhould, ſurely, ſubſtitute in its place ſomething equally definite and preciſe. Every other kind of anſwer will be but a cavil inſtead of a refutation; and, far from aiding, will tend only to embarraſs the important cauſe, which inceſſantly demands the adoption of DETERMINATE—as well as of vigorous meaſures.

BEFORE, however, any meaſures can have a chance for ſucceſs, the Combined Powers muſt open their eyes, and ſee the War in its genuine nature, and in its true cauſes. They muſt diſcover, not only the extent of the danger to which they are expoſed, but alſo their *real* enemy. That enemy is not the French Nation—not even the

French Republic—but the French Revolution. This is the enemy, which having been ſuffered, for want of timely reſiſtance, to become formidable, is the actual cauſe of all the calamities they deplore, and, if not checked, the certain cauſe of all the miſchiefs they apprehend. Their own efforts have failed of ſucceſs, only becauſe they were miſdirected. Like a hoodwinked combatant, they did not ward off the coming blow, for they ſaw not from whence it came; while, for want of perceiving where it was neceſſary to ſtrike, their own blows have been waſted in the air. Surely it is time to tear the bandage from their eyes, to look their adverſary in the face, and to employ all their endeavours to cruſh him before they be themſelves overwhelmed. All their exertions will be thrown away unleſs they be directed againſt a Revolution, which, if it exiſt much longer, will ſpread the Revolutionary Wildfire over the earth, and ſubject every civilized State to the ravages of a Nation of armed and diſciplined Robbers, ſubſiſting only by excurſions and plunder.

The Revolution of France, inſtead of being confounded with other Revolutions, ſhould be conſidered as an event altogether *ſui generis*. It is the nature of this Revolution not merely to ſubvert the exiſting Government, but to overthrow every eſtabliſhment, civil and religious; every

every inſtitution, political and moral. It acts by a ſubtle principle, which, like the electrical fluid, can penetrate every-where, diſſolve the firmeſt and cloſeſt ties, and reduce ſociety, as it were, into a ſtate of fuſion. It is not an event of a local nature, otherwiſe than as it took its riſe in France: that country had nothing excluſive in it, but as it was the ſpot whence ruſhed forth the evils with which it was charged; evils far more deſtructive than thoſe that iſſued from Pandora's box, and which threaten to render human exiſtence a moſt grievous misfortune. The tendency of this Revolution is univerſal. It is a contagion which human nature is every-where prediſpoſed to imbibe, for it acts directly upon the paſſions, vices, and infirmities of mankind. The natural boundaries of States furniſh no impediment to its courſe. Mountains, Rivers and Seas preſent no obſtacle to its progreſs. Armies and Navies can oppoſe but a temporary check to its advances. It tends every-where to deſtroy, not only the bonds and attachments which conſtitute the ſocial union in every body politic, but even thoſe national characteriſtics, thoſe ancient and rival animoſities, ſo conſervative of the identity of States, and, (whatever modern philoſophers may imagine,) ſo conducive to their proſperity, by calling their reſources and energies into action. The diſorganizing principle of this Revolution tends, in ſhort, to ſubvert all order and ſociety;

to annihilate all diſtinctions, great and ſmall, which are eſſential to the harmony of the world; to derange all equilibrium, and remove whatever can preſerve the poize of ſyſtems or the balance of powers; and, under the falſe and enſnaring pretext of an inſidious Philanthropy, to reduce the world to a ſtate of chaotic equality, in which France claims the pre-eminence ſo juſtly due to her, that of being the centre of this boundleſs confuſion—the focus of Univerſal Anarchy.

It is therefore the French Revolution that the Combined Powers ſhould conſider as their real and only enemy, which all their efforts ſhould be employed to deſtroy. They will otherwiſe be waſting the precious and fleeting moments, which they ſtill command, to provide for their future ſafety, in an unavailing ſtruggle with effects, while the cauſe of the miſchief will become irreſiſtible. Their conteſt muſt be, not merely with the Armies of France, but with its Revolution, againſt which all their efforts, phyſical and moral, ſhould be directed. They muſt lay the axe to the root of that accurſed tree, which, while they have been vainly endeavouring to cut off ſome of its branches, has been ſpreading on all ſides with inconceivable rapidity.

It ſhould not, however, be forgotten, that in directing all its efforts againſt the French Revolu-

ſent,

tion, the War continues in principle, what it has been from its commencement, a War of DEFENCE. Its real object is the re-eſtabliſhment of SECURITY. It is on this ground that all idea of Peace is romantic while France is Revolutionary, becauſe, while ſhe is ſo, no ſafety can exiſt for any other State. The true reaſon that pacification with France in her preſent ſituation is impracticable, is not the particular *form* of her Government, but the *abſence* of Government from that country. Whenever, inſtead of being a prey to Anarchy; whenever, inſtead of being ruled by ſucceſſive Factions, devouring each other, and invalidating each the acts of its predeceſſor, France ſhall have a fixed and ſettled Government, compatible with the ſafety of other States, poſſeſſed of firm and eſtabliſhed authority, capable of performing its engagements, and recognizing the eſſential principles of civil ſociety, the laws of nations, and the rights of other Governments; then, and not before, it will be rational to talk of treating: but till then the very mention of negotiation will be as diſtinguiſhable for folly as it is for puſillanimity. That event, in the Author's opinion (for which opinion he here aſſigns his reaſons), cannot be brought about (at leaſt, not in time to ſave the reſt of the world,) by any other means than the reſtoration of the legitimate Monarchy of France; but nothing can be more obvious than that France is not at preſent

ſent in the condition above deſcribed, and therefore not in a *negotiable* ſtate. And yet, incredible as it may appear—while it is ſo neceſſary to throw away the ſcabbard, and to reſolve to ſheath the ſword only in the vitals of the enemy, Europe is made to reſound with exclamations for Peace, and even Great Britain is daily inſulted with the degrading propoſal, where a clamour for Peace is made, not merely the ſtalking horſe of faction, but even an inſtrument of Sedition.

It is impoſſible, at ſuch a time, to entertain a ſerious idea of Peace without entirely forgetting, that the eſſence of Peace is ſecurity, and that, without the latter, the former would be but an aërial, fleeting, and deceptious form. But inſtead of being productive of ſecurity, Peace, at this time, would be the ſource of dangers—it might prove the means of a general Revolution. Under ſuch circumſtances, the advocates for Peace are its greateſt foes; they are perhaps the cauſe that ſolid Peace cannot now exiſt; they may be the cauſe that it ſhall never exiſt again for the preſent generation. The word Peace cannot now be pronounced without diſgrace; the mouth that utters it is diſhonoured; its ſound is deleterious to the beſt intereſts of Humanity. It tends, each time that it is repeated, to unnerve the public mind, to draw off the attention from the nature, and to impede the proſecution, of the War, which, to preſerve

preſerve the exiſtence of Society, demands all our attention and all our ardour. Were that word, indeed, to be confined to its true ſenſe, it could not now be uſed at all by any deſcription of perſons. Were Peace and Security as inſeparable in language as they are in ſubſtance, they would be alike excluded from both converſation and debate; for no one, in his ſenſes, could fall into ſo monſtrous and glaring an abſurdity, as to talk of treating for PEACE AND SECURITY with the CONVENTION OF FRANCE.

THOSE perſons who are apt to indulge an impatience for Peace, not becauſe they have the leaſt confidence in the ſtability of any Peace, that could be now patched up, but from motives of deſpondency, excited by the difficulties and dangers of the war; who, to eſcape from a preſent evil, would plunge blindfold into a greater; ſuch perſons are entreated to conſider, that the MASTER-KEY to ſucceſs has not yet been tried, and that without a fair trial of its effect, it would be unreaſonable to deſpair. To recommend earneſtly ſuch a trial, without farther loſs of time, and before it may be too late, is the main object of the following pages.

# FARTHER REFLECTIONS,

&c. &c.

SINCE the publication of the former Reflections ſubmitted to the Conſideration of the Combined Powers, events and changes, of an aſtoniſhing nature, have taken place in France, if, indeed, any thing can aſtoniſh, after the tranſactions which have diſtinguiſhed that country during the laſt five years. The dictatorſhip of Robeſpierre has been overthrown—the ſyſtem of terror, which he wound up to its higheſt pitch, has been formally renounced—and moderation is become "the Order of the Day." The Guillotine has been removed into the back-ground; and even the Jacobin Clubs, and the affiliated ſocieties, have been ſacrificed to the momentary ſecurity of the triumphant party.

THIS laſt of the many Revolutions exhibited by France, ſince ſhe has been in a *revolving* ſtate, and which has been effected by the fall of Ro-

 beſpierre,

beſpierre, profeſſes to have ſubſtituted a ſyſtem of moderation for a ſyſtem of terror. But that profeſſion, like all thoſe which have contributed to the progreſs of the Revolution, is but a mere pretext, calculated to deceive and miſlead all who place any confidence in it. It is true, terror was the feature which characterized the reign of the above furious demagogue; but where is the moderation of his ſucceſſors, and in what does it conſiſt? Who are the men that lay claim to this amiable quality? What are their preſent pretenſions? What was their previous character? Is their moderation founded in principles of Humanity; or is it merely a cloak, aſſumed for the convenience of the moment, and meant to be thrown off whenever convenience ſhall require a change of ſyſtem? Are not theſe Partiſans of Moderation the very men who have planned or perpetrated all the atrocities of the Revolution? Are not their hands ſtained with the blood of their King, and do they not glory to this hour in their execrable treaſon? Have they not attained their pre-eminence by a rapid ſucceſſion of crimes and maſſacres, which defile hiſtory with its fouleſt ſtain? Have they not been aſſociated with Robeſpierre himſelf in all his cruelties? And have they pulled him down for any other reaſon, than becauſe he wiſhed to make the whole power to centre in himſelf—becauſe he wanted to deprive them of their ſhare of the tyranny, which they

they had jointly eſtabliſhed, and to render them merely inſtrumental to his own ambition?

SUCH are the *Moderates* of France. Now what is their moderation? It is a ſyſtem of violence and tyranny, which has no example in the hiſtory of the world, except the ſyſtem to which it immediately ſucceeded. It has no better claim to the title of moderation, than the ſlight and momentary mitigation of the moſt excruciating tortures has to that of comfortable eaſe. The compulſory requiſition of perſons and property continues in full force. The innumerable engines of violence and oppreſſion are as active as before. The axe only, inſtead of being kept in conſtant and unremitting exerciſe, is ſuſpended over the heads of the ſtill affrighted and trembling people.

THE truth is, that nothing but the aſtoniſhing ſeverity, by which alone Robeſpierre could maintain his horrid ſway, could have enabled the ſyſtem which has ſucceeded thereto, to aſſume the title of Moderation. It is by the aid of compariſon that things often aſſume names, to which, in a juſt ſenſe, they are by no means intitled. The people, who had immediate deſtruction before their eyes, are rejoiced at a reſpite. They are happy in being permitted to breathe a while, and to enjoy a ceſſation from the horrid work of

death. On a momentary eſcape they build their hopes of future preſervation; and, without the ſmalleſt relief in other reſpects, they recollect their paſt dangers, and call their preſent ſtate "Moderation."

So inexpreſſibly odious and revolting was the ſanguinary reign of Robeſpierre, that his ſucceſsful rivals cannot fail to derive a degree of popularity, and to acquire a momentary ſtrength, by appearing to adopt a ſyſtem different from that which he purſued. Succeeding to ſuch a Monſter, they, Monſters as they are, fortify their own domination by the horror and deteſtation which he inſpired, and which they take care to keep up by a thouſand artifices, and even by relaxing, as far as they dare, the ſprings of rigour and ſeverity, by which he maintained his aſcendancy. They find it a prodigious advantage that a compariſon with him cannot but operate in their favour. It ſhould alſo be remembered, that they ſucceed to the direction of that immenſe maſs of organized force, which has been collected and formed by means, very different from thoſe of moderation; and the *impetus* being once ſo powerfully given, they can for a time direct and govern the machine by a much leſs degree of violence, than was neceſſary to put it into motion. And alas! the aſtoniſhing ſucceſſes of their arms and the rapidity of their conqueſts come in aid of their other advantages,

vantages, and enable them, with more ſecurity and effect, to ſuſtain their treacherous and unnatural character of moderation.

But who is there endued with a ſufficient portion of credulity to place the leaſt confidence in theſe pretences to moderation, or in the ſtability of ſuch a ſyſtem? Sooner or later muſt the guillotine reſume its ſway, unleſs, indeed, the novel prejudice attached to its name, ſhould render it neceſſary to ſubſtitute ſome other Revolutionary inſtrument of death. The cauſes which have produced its momentary ſuſpenſion are fleeting and precarious. The furious elements remain unimpaired, and are ready to burſt forth again with as much violence as ever. Terror has been the grand ſupport of the Revolution, and is ſtill neceſſary to uphold it. Without this corner-ſtone, the immenſe maſs of violence and oppreſſion, which remains perfect in all its other parts, muſt fall to pieces. By no other means can the people be compelled to ſubmit to a privation of all the rights of ſociety, which they have ſacrificed to a purſuit of the viſionary and impracticable "Rights of Man." The novelty of the preſent ſcene will ſoon be over. The impreſſion of dread, left by Robeſpierre, will gradually wear away, and the people will begin to inquire, why they muſt endure the tyranny and injuſtice of a ſet of miſcreant uſurpers, and be obliged, at their command, to march, and fight,

and bleed—to till and reap, and abandon the fruit of their labours to a mercileſs requiſition, retaining ſcarcely enough to keep body and ſoul together? To ſuch inquiries the axe alone can give a ſatisfactory anſwer. To theſe juſt and powerful cauſes of diſſatisfaction will be united the immenſe torrent of popular paſſions, ever ready to burſt forth, upon the removal of any reſtraint. The numerous factions which have been ſuppreſſed, will avail themſelves of ſo fair an opportunity to ſtruggle again for the aſcendancy. The Jacobins, every-where diſperſed, will labour inceſſantly to regain their loſt influence; and the ruling party will find it impoſſible to preſerve their power, and to keep under their rivals and competitors, without the aſſiſtance of extreme rigour and ſeverity. Perhaps they will avail themſelves of the odium which they have ſucceeded in fixing upon the term Jacobiniſm, and every one deſtined to deſtruction, becauſe ſuſpected to be hoſtile to their reign, will be hunted down under the cry of Jacobin; which, inſtead of *Ariſtocrat*, will, for a time, be the cant term of reproach. But while Jacobiniſm is thus perſecuted in appearance, its ſpirit will ſurvive and flouriſh under ſome other form. It is a ſyſtem too favourable to organized anarchy to be abandoned. And ſhould the avowed Jacobins be totally cruſhed, (a matter, as yet, by no means certain,) new Jacobins will riſe, Phœnix-like, from their aſhes; and the factions into which

which the victorious party will inſtantly ſplit, will combat each other with Jacobin arts and Jacobin principles.

But, in truth, all our ſpeculations reſpecting the internal affairs of France lead only to this concluſion—that it is impoſſible to form any rational conjecture, or to build any well-founded dependence, on a matter ſo extremely fluctuating, unſettled, and precarious. What occurs to day affords no clue whereby to judge of to-morrow. There are no *data* from which to argue, no fixed or ſettled principles, whence to depart. While France is Revolutionary, ſhe will defy all future, as ſhe has baffled all paſt conjecture. The pretended moderation of the day is but one of the *phaſes* of a Revolution, which threatens, in its progreſs, to derange every thing within the ſcope of its influence, and to make all orderly and civilized States "ſtart from their ſpheres," and ruſh into the immenſe void of Anarchy and Chaos. What appearance that Revolution will next exhibit it is as difficult to ſurmiſe, as it was to foretel the paſt or the preſent. Even thoſe perſons who, for the time being, appear at the head of affairs, have no influence over the cauſes which tend to keep France in conſtant agitation and fluctuation. They are, indeed, the foremoſt in this ſcene of confuſion and uproar; but the ruſhing torrent is behind them; and while they ſeem

to drive, they are themſelves driven. They cannot recede, but muſt go on, coſt what it may, in their career of violence and iniquity. They have no power over the whirlwind, on which they ſeem to ride, and which they have contributed to raiſe. They are themſelves the ſport of the boiſterous elements which they have excited, in conjunction with many others, who have been ſucceſſively demoliſhed by the fury of the ſtorm; and it is more than probable, that the next blaſt will hurry them, in an inſtant, from their ſlippery and baſeleſs elevation into the ſame gulph with their predeceſſors *.

The material difference between the Revolutionary ſyſtems of terror and moderation, is by no means in favour of the latter. It is a falſe and treacherous moderation, tending only to deceive. The real diſtinction between the two ſyſtems is, that the one diſplays openly what the other attempts to conceal. They are equally deſtructive, becauſe they are equally a part of that general ſyſtem, which tends to univerſal deſolation

* What an inſtructive warning does the fate of French *agitators* ſound in the ears of thoſe, who ſeek to unſettle other States, and to diſturb the foundations which have for ages formed the baſis of ſocial order and ſecurity! After ſuch an example, is it poſſible for theſe raſh adventurers to think, (as Mr. Horne Tooke profeſſes to do) that they would be able to ſtop the machine of reform when once ſet in motion, and get out "*at Hounſlow*," or any-where elſe, till it has hurried them on to deſtruction?

and

and ruin. But of the two, the moderate is the moſt dangerous, becauſe it ſeeks to inſinuate itſelf into our confidence, to put us off our guard, and to lull that alarm, which would impel us to provide for our ſecurity. It will deceive all who confide in it. Should any Emigrants be tempted to truſt themſelves within its reach, they will, in all probability, be the victims of their credulity, as thouſands have been, who, at different periods of the Revolution, have truſted to the baſiliſk faith of Decrees. The men who wield this gilded ſceptre of moderation have made themſelves ſufficiently known, and it has not yet been proved that they have undergone any transformation. They act only to injure, they ſpeak only to deceive, they promiſe only to betray: and, what is equally deſerving of attention, they hold their power by ſo precarious a tenure, that their ability to perform their promiſes and engagements does not exceed their ſincerity in making them *.

But whatever be the real temper of thoſe perſons who, becauſe they appear foremoſt in the ranks of confuſion, and give the word of command, ſeem to be poſſeſſed of the governing power—whatever be the faſhion of the day, ſet by Paris, and inſtantly adopted, with ſlaviſh ſervility, by the reſt of France — whether the prevailing

* Thoſe who talk of treating for peace with ſuch men, ought ſurely to prove that this deſcription is not applicable.

ſyſtem

ſyſtem aſſume the ſoft ſemblance of moderation, or the more diſguſting hue of terror—ſhall the reſt of Europe be the ſport of ſo capricious an influence? Shall the Belligerent Powers be diverted from their objects, or fluctuate in their plans, becauſe appearances are every day aſſuming a new face in a country, which is ſubject to no fixed and ſettled principle, and which is as deſtitute of ſtability as it is of virtue? That Country, amidſt all its internal viciſſitudes, is becoming every hour more dangerous to other States—more formidable in its force, more alarming in its conqueſts. In its hoſtilities, in its ambition, in its inſolence, nothing like moderation is to be found *. Every change that there takes place, only brings with it freſh proof, that Europe can never attain ſecurity, or enjoy repoſe, until France ſhall have exchanged her Revolutionary ſtate, for that of order and ſubjection to regular and ſtable government.

THIS is a truth, which, amidſt all the chaos of confuſion, ſhines forth with clear and ſteady light, and which is conſtantly acquiring additional luſtre, from the lengthened continuance of the ſurrounding obſcurity. While deſtitute of all *fixed prin-*

* The obſervation of Barrere in the Sitting of Nov. 14, is but too juſt: "Through a fatality generally attendant on "Revolutions, every thing but victory has changed around "us. Paſſions, intereſts, fraternity, projects, politics, public "opinion—all have aſſumed a new form."

*ciple*

*ciple* of Government, calculated to maintain and preſerve a ſettled and orderly ſtate of things, the condition of France muſt continue to be Anarchical. If, indeed, it were poſſible to cut her off from all connection and interference with other ſtates, her Anarchy would be of ſhort duration, and ſhe muſt ſpeedily, from the operation of internal cauſes, return to a ſtate of civil organization, under the control of regular and permanent Government, which is the natural ſtate of ſocial man. But ſituate, as ſhe is, in the heart of Europe, with ſuch immenſe reſources at her command, with ſuch opportunity and ſuch ability to moleſt other Countries, ſhe has it conſtantly in her power to make the principle of moleſtation auxiliary to the principle of anarchy; and as every ſyſtem, when once eſtabliſhed, ſeeks to prolong its exiſtence, ſhe is ſure to avail herſelf of that power. In other words, by the aid of external war, ſhe may ſubſiſt without ſettled order or regular coherence—and the force neceſſary to be exerted to carry on that War, aided by the pretexts of deluſion and the enthuſiaſm to which it gives occaſion, will ſupply the place of an internal regulator, and enable the ſucceſſion of ruling parties to exerciſe, one after another, the Supreme Power, undefined as it is, though none of them be able long to retain it. Thus is Anarchy within fed and maintained by hoſtility without; and the Nation is thereby held together, though in a ſtate of inceſſant

ſant reſtleſsneſs and change, and deſtitute of any *internal* tie, which could otherwiſe prevent it from falling to pieces. The Few are thus enabled to keep the Multitude in a ſtate, not merely of forced ſubjection, but of oppreſſion and miſery beyond all example. The individuals poſſeſſing the aſcendancy are, indeed, frequently cut off, and the acquiſition of the ſceptre of Anarchy is but the prelude to deſtruction: but the Anarchical Monſter is not enfeebled by the overthrow of this or that party—no ſooner does he loſe one head than his generative powers inſtantly ſupply another: and however theſe heads may vary in aſpect or in hue, they are equally voracious and deſtructive.

The juſtneſs of the above ſtatement is ſo apparent, that it is perpetually recurred to by thoſe perſons, who are inceſſantly calling out for Peace, without daring to encounter the queſtion, whether Peace be at this time attainable. Such perſons both ſee and admit the inſeparable connection between the Anarchy of France and the War, and they therefore contend, that the diſcontinuance of the one will certainly produce the termination of the other. But who is there ſo blind as not to perceive, that this argument, like the cauſe it is employed to ſupport, inverts the order of things, by making cauſe and effect to aſſume each other's place? It ſuppoſes the Anarchy to have reſulted from

from the War, inſtead of having produced it. The inference would not, indeed, be concluſive, even if the ſuppoſition were well-founded. For if the War, co-operating with other cauſes, had thrown France into her preſent ſtate of confuſion, it by no means follows that it would be either ſafe or practicable to abandon it, while ſhe remains in that ſituation. But it is eſtabliſhed beyond all controverſy, by the undeniable evidence of facts, that France firſt broke looſe from every ſpecies of internal reſtraint, and then, by a very natural tranſition, became a ſource of external moleſtation and annoyance. She has not only been, in every inſtance during the preſent War, both the formal and the virtual aggreſſor in hoſtilities, but the Revolution itſelf, from its very commencement, was, both in principle, language, and conduct, aggreſſive on every other State, and hoſtile to every exiſting Government, and to every ſpecies of lawful Authority. It was a Revolution founded on principles which tend directly to Anarchy, becauſe they are incompatible with ſocial order and civil ſubordination; it aſſumed, at the very outſet, a character of univerſal proſelytiſm, inſolence, and encroachment; and it exhibited, in its earlieſt ſtage, an aſpect the moſt hoſtile to the tranquillity of mankind. It affected to take for its baſis a Declaration of the Rights of Man, which, inſtead of being confined to ſpecific re-

gulations, applicable to the ſtate of France, ſeems to have been intended as an act of Legiſlation for the whole human race; while by holding forth general aſſertions of abſtract and unalienable rights, no where exiſting in practice, it condemned, without reſerve, every ſubſiſting Government as unlawful. The uſurping Aſſembly which framed this Declaration, (as well as each ſucceeding Aſſembly,) made no ſcruple to repreſent every Sovereign as a Tyrant, and every People as enſlaved. Even the liberty of Great Britain was looked down upon with contempt, and Engliſhmen were to owe their Freedom to the example of France. Nor was the Aſſembly remiſs in enforcing its principles and its theories, by its conduct and example. The Members of that Aſſembly, in direct violation of their truſt and of their oaths, aboliſhed all diſtinctions of rank, thoſe neceſſary gradations in the ſocial edifice—diſplaced all the exiſting powers—trampled upon the rights of property—connived at the moſt atrocious exceſſes—demoliſhed the Church—and, by depoſing the King from his lawful authority and his hereditary dignity, (though they retained him as a phantom of Royalty, to make him ſubſervient to their purpoſes), *they prepared his inevitable deſtruction.* They thus declared, that the kind of Revolution, of which France was intended to furniſh a model for general

ral

ral imitation, was a complete diſſolution of all the bands of Society—that the Rights of Man, which they ſought to inculcate and to eſtabliſh, were not thoſe rational and ſalutary rights, both of Sovereign and Subject, which conſiſt in the right to protection on the one ſide, and to allegiance, reſpect, and ſubmiſſion on the other, and which preſcribe to each correſponding duties, as the condition of his reſpective claims—no ſuch rights were to be found in their code; but inſtead of them the denial of all rights on the part of the Sovereign, and the aſſertion of the right of diſobedience, inſurrection, and rebellion, on the part of the People. Farther, by applying the exerciſe of theſe horrid rights to the perſon and government of the moſt mild and benign Prince, that ever ſat on the Gallic Throne, they proclaimed to the world, that wanting no excuſe or palliation from the actual exiſtence of intolerable oppreſſion, it was a deliberate, metaphyſical, and cold-hearted rebellion, of which their Revolution preſented an example to mankind. In like manner did the infant Revolution, like another Hercules in his cradle, announce betimes, to other States, what it would one day become, by graſping at and ſeizing every right, even of foreign Powers, that was within its reach. The rights of the German Princes, *feudatories* in Alſace and Lorraine, (rights long ſince eſtabliſhed by ſolemn Treaties and uninterruptedly enjoyed),

and the Sovereignty of the Pope, as a Temporal Prince in Avignon, were invaded and uſurped, without the ſmalleſt ceremony or colour of juſtice. And thus an early preſage was given of that univerſal aggreſſion, by which the maturer age of the Revolution was to be diſtinguiſhed.

The progreſs of the Revolution, ever ſince, has been accompanied with an increaſing inſolence and hoſtility towards other States, with unceaſing endeavours to ſtimulate the people of every Country to follow ſo *bright* an example, and to excite every where a ſpirit of turbulence, diſcontent, and diſaffection; until at length the Trumpet of Revolt was openly ſounded to the whole World—and by the Decree of November 19, 1792, the Convention of France *offered fraternity and aſſiſtance to all People who ſhould wiſh to recover their liberty.* This general Declaration of War was, as might have been expected, ſpeedily followed by an actual commencement of hoſtilities, againſt ſuch of the Belligerent Powers as had not been previouſly attacked; while, to keep open the ſources of neceſſary ſupplies, other Powers were cajoled, as well to betray, by a baſe, daſtardly, and ruinous Neutrality, the general cauſe of Society, as to overlook the inſults they had received, in common with their neighbours, and the particular attempts which had been made to allure

their

their own ſubjects, to embrace the faith of the Revolution. Now, indeed, that the military force of the Republic has been completely organized; now that, by means alike horrible and unprecedented, and which no regular Government could employ, *that* force has been extended to a degree unknown in the annals of the Monarchy, and been crowned with aſtoniſhing ſucceſs—the maſk is taken off—the ardour of French Philanthropy is cooled—the Convention cares no longer for the liberty of other States—and the arms of France are pointed, not towards univerſal Freedom, but univerſal Conqueſt. The moſt moderate pretenſion now advanced, is to make the Bank of the Rhine the boundary of the French Territory; a pretenſion which, if advanced by the Monarchy, would have been repelled at any coſt, and at any riſk, by the united force of the reſt of Europe. It ſurely behoves Europe to conſider, very ſeriouſly, the infinitely more powerful reaſons which call upon them to reſiſt ſuch a pretenſion, and, indeed, every pretenſion on the part of the French Anarchical Republic. It behoves Europe to reflect ſeriouſly on the conſequences, attending the eſtabliſhment of ſuch a Republic; whereby France would be converted into a State altogether military; in which induſtry, commerce, arts, and ſciences, would have no other object, than to ſupport numberleſs armies, ever ready to ruſh forth and deſpoil neighbouring

countries; and where the plough, the loom, and the forge, would be valued only for the ſake of furniſhing the implements and the neceſſaries of war.

As, therefore, it is clear that the French Revolution had a direct tendency to prove a ſource of general diſturbance; and as, in point of fact, it has endangered the ſafety of every State, and the exiſtence of all lawful Government; and *that*, as well by aiming to excite every where a ſpirit of reſtleſſneſs, inſubordination and revolt, as by actually kindling a general War; it follows, as a plain and undeniable conſequence, that ſo long as France, under the influence of its Revolution, ſhall continue to be Anarchical, Europe muſt be a ſtranger to repoſe and ſecurity. While France is deſtitute of regular and ſtable Government, War, with all its concomitant dangers, muſt continue; unleſs, indeed, it ſhould terminate fatally for civil ſociety; a ſuppoſition becoming leſs improbable every day. The Anarchy of France, poſſeſſed of ſufficient power to render the conqueſt of that Country almoſt a chimerical ſpeculation, but incapable at the ſame time of ſubſiſting without the aid of War, will, for its own ſake, reſort to the means neceſſary to prolong its exiſtence. It is a Monſter that feeds on War; and, ſituated in France, it has, unfortunately, ample means of ſubſiſtence at its command.

mand. Peace would be poiſon to this Monſter, which it has too much ſagacity to be prevailed on to ſwallow. The only way, therefore, to attain tranquillity, is to kill the Hydra.—But he muſt be killed out-right. He has wonderful powers of reſuſcitation; and if left, even at the laſt gaſp, he is ſure to recover, and to become again as formidable as ever. But how can his complete deſtruction be effected? There is but one way; and that is obviouſly pointed out by the nature and the hiſtory of the Revolution, which clearly proves that the Monſter can never be intirely deſtroyed, until the lawful Government, to the ſubverſion of which he owes his exiſtence, be reſtored. If the Combined Powers forget this truth, though they may, perhaps, ſucceed in weakening and reducing their enemy, ſo as to obtain a ſhort interval of deluſive repoſe, he will ſoon be renovated, and attack them again, when it will be out of their power to ſuſtain another ſhock. Nothing can be more plain and ſimple than this propoſition, nor can any mathematical demonſtration be attended with greater certainty;—FRANCE BECAME ANARCHICAL BY THE SUBVERSION OF HER ANCIENT AND LAWFUL GOVERNMENT, AND SHE CAN ONLY CEASE TO BE SO BY ITS RE-ESTABLISHMENT. This is the only event, in which ſhe can ceaſe to be Revolu-

tionary, and either enjoy order and tranquillity herſelf, or ſuffer them to exiſt elſewhere.

Thoſe perſons, whoſe aim it is to prolong and to extend Anarchy, loſe no opportunity of repreſenting the ancient Government of France as an intolerable Deſpotiſm; and they thereby prevail on many well-diſpoſed perſons, who rely more on the aſſertions of others, than on their own inveſtigation of facts, to deprecate the return of ſuch a ſyſtem. Nor, indeed, is it unuſual to hear it maintained, that France was intirely deſtitute of a Conſtitution; a doctrine which was induſtriouſly propagated at the beginning of the Revolution, and which, by gaining credit in the minds of the people, had conſiderable influence in prevailing on them to part with the ſubſtance, in the purſuit of a mere ſhadow. They have, however, ſince learned to their coſt, what it is to be without a Conſtitution *; for the paper ſyſtems, which, under that name, have ſucceeded each other ſo rapidly during the Revolution, were nothing elſe than pretexts for the exerciſe of the moſt unqualified and rigorous Deſpotiſm. Nothiug can be more abſurd

* A like abſurdity was maintained in reſpect of this Country by Thomas Paine, and propagated by his fellow-labourers, the Conſtitutional and London Correſponding Societies.

than

than to ſuppoſe an extenſive and populous country to have ſubſiſted, in an uniform manner, under the ſame form of Government, and the ſame fundamental Laws, from century to century—frequently engaged in foreign war, and, what is far more deciſive in that reſpect, often enjoying conſiderable intervals of peace—proceeding progreſſively in all the arts and refinements of civilization, and attaining a high degree of proſperity—and all this without a Conſtitution. But it is not only true that France had a Conſtitution, but that ſhe had ſuch a one as was beſt adapted to the genius, the manners, and the habits of the people. It was, in its ſpirit and eſſence, favourable to their enjoyment of as much freedom, as was conſiſtent with the aggregate of their ſituation *. Their Monarch, far from being a Deſpot,

* It ſcarcely denotes a greater ignorance of human nature to contend for *abſtract* and unreſtrained liberty, than to ſuppoſe that the ſame portion of it is applicable to every country. Habits, manners, extent, population, national character, local ſituation, particularly as inſular or continental, and a variety of other circumſtances, may render the ſame degree of freedom ſalutary in one country, which would be deſtructive in another. The greateſt poſſible misfortune for a country is to be without a fixed and ſtable Government, and thoſe who attempt to diſturb and unhinge ſuch an Inſtitution, in order to make way for untried novelties, are the moſt dangerous foes to ſociety. Any eſtabliſhed ſyſtem, which produces the grand object for which Government is eſtabliſhed, by preſerving order, harmony, and quiet,

a Deſpot, was ſubject to a great variety of checks and reſtraints. He could not impoſe a ſingle tax, nor make a ſingle law, by his own authority, but, in the abſence of the States General, was often ſucceſsfully reſiſted by the Par-

is infinitely preferable to ſpeculations and changes, which tend only to introduce confuſion, and to occaſion the loſs of ſubſiſting advantages. Nothing, however, is more clear than that the Government of France did not juſtly come under the denomination of a Deſpotiſm. Beſides the numerous obſtacles which were oppoſed to the abſolute will of the Monarch, the force of public opinion in that country was an inſuperable bar to deſpotic authority. A compariſon too between that and ſome other countries, both ancient and modern, ſufficiently point out the difference between a State, where the will of the Sovereign is alone the law, and one, where the ſubjection of that will to numerous reſtraints, renders his authority limited, inſtead of abſolute. But the moſt ſtriking compariſon that can be adduced, exiſts between the former ſtate of France, under her Kings, and her preſent ſtate, under her Revolutionary Tyrants. Such a compariſon exhibits, in the moſt forcible manner, the real diſtinction between a Monarchy, limited by laws and inſtitutions, and a ſanguinary and ferocious Deſpotiſm.

It may not be amiſs to remark, that a French writer has gone the length to aſſert, that the ancient Government of France, though it had the name and quality of a Monarchy, was ſo limited by laws and inſtitutions, as to be in reality neither a monarchy, ariſtocracy, nor democracy, but a fourth ſpecies compounded of all three. See *Recueil des Reglements, Edicts Ordonnances, et Obſervations, ſur le Fait des Finances*—publiſhed in 1599, under the adminiſtration of Sully, with the licence of Henry IV. and quoted by the Editors of the Annual Regiſter for 1792.

liaments,

liaments, and obliged, thereby, to renounce his intentions. The ſame powerful bodies had a right of remonſtrance, and of carrying to the Throne the wiſhes and complaints of his people. And his ſubjects, in an individual as well as in a corporate capacity, ſuſtained law ſuits with the Crown, and were frequently ſucceſsful.

It is not meant to be denied, that in a courſe of time numerous and groſs abuſes had crept in, which, undoubtedly, required correction; abuſes which did certainly obſcure, in ſome degree, the principles of the Conſtitution, and impair its energy. But theſe abuſes were far, during the mild reign of Louis XVI. from being applied to the purpoſes of oppreſſion; and they were on the point of being exterminated, by that benevolent and truly patriotic King, when the Authors of the Revolution took a baſe advantage of his anxiety for his people's welfare, and of his too yielding diſpoſition, to overwhelm himſelf and his country with deſtruction. In his royal and gracious Declaration of the 23d of June 1789, to the States General, which he had convened for the purpoſe of receiving the complaints of his people, and of relieving, in the moſt effectual manner, all their grievances, he propoſed remedies for every abuſe which had been ſuppoſed to exiſt, and even endeavoured to remove every undue

undue inequality. One of the principal ſubjects of complaint had been an arbitrary power of arreſt, exerciſed by the Crown, by means of *Lettres de Cachet*, but which in his reign exiſted more in recollection than in practice, and which, however liable to perverſion, was never oppreſſive or formidable to the great body of the people. This power he propoſed to aboliſh; and he invited the States to deviſe means to effect that abolition, without expoſing, either the public tranquillity, which, the ſudden removal of any eſtabliſhed barrier might endanger, or the honour of families, which, in that refined country, was a matter of exquiſite ſenſibility. Another of the hardſhips, principally complained of, was an inequality in the collection of taxes, ariſing from privileges in favour of particular orders. Theſe privileges were fully provided againſt in his Majeſty's Declaration; although they had been previouſly and voluntarily relinquiſhed by the orders, in whoſe favour they had been originally eſtabliſhed, for juſt and rational purpoſes.* To complete his gracious offers, the King propoſed, in conformity to the ſpirit of the French Conſtitution, (which in this reſpect had become dor-

* The pecuniary exemptions enjoyed by the Nobility and Clergy of France, did not amount annually to 150,000l. and were almoſt, if not fully, counterbalanced by the *Droits de Contrôle*, and the High Capitation Tax, to which thoſe orders were ſubject. See Mr. Gifford's Letter to Lord Lauderdale.

mant,)

mant,) that the conſent of the people in the States ſhould be neceſſary to authorize the impoſition of taxes. In ſhort, this beneficent Prince, abundantly more eager to remedy every grievance, than his people were to utter their complaints, propoſed in that Declaration a plan, not merely to reform, but to check and prevent, as much as poſſible, the corruptions of the State; and which, if accepted, as it deſerved to be, with joy and gratitude, and carried into effect as far as it was conſiſtent with the principles of the ancient Conſtitution*, might have been rendered the MAGNA CHARTA of France: and it has been juſtly ſaid, that a bad King would never have granted ſo much, but after the loſs of many battles.

POSTERITY will ſcarcely believe that in return for ſo much benevolence and goodneſs, this gracious Monarch, this indulgent Father of his People, after being loaded with numberleſs inſults, during a captivity of more than three years, was brought to a mock trial and an ignominious execution!—See him, Frenchmen—ſee your affectionate—your once-beloved Sovereign—expiring

* There ſeems, indeed, to be ſome reaſon to conclude, that this Declaration deviated in ſome degree from the antient Conſtitution, by fettering too much the exerciſe of the Executive Power. But that defect might have been corrected, if the States had taken for their guide the ſpirit of that Conſtitution, as they were bound by their duty and their oaths to have done,

on

on a ſcaffold—the victim of foul rebellion and relentleſs barbarity—denied by his ſavage murderers, impatient for his blood, even a momentary reſpite—refuſed, in his laſt moments, the common privilege of the vileſt malefactors, a parting addreſs to the ſurrounding multitude—precipitated into eternity with the unfiniſhed prayer ſtill quivering on his lips—his royal head held up by murderous hands, and proclaimed to be the head of a Traitor—his bleeding corpſe caſt, with indignity, into the neareſt place of interment, without a ſingle form of religious rite or even of decent ſepulture—and haſtily conſumed, leſt ſome loyal ſympathizing tear ſhould fall on the ſenſeleſs clay.—And ſhall not, O once loyal people!—ſhall not the review of ſuch a ſcene, while it rouſes your juſt vengeance againſt its vile perpetrators, revive your attachment to the Crown and Family of your injured Monarch?—Shall it not rivet your fidelity to the Son of your murdered Sovereign—the deſcendant of your Fourth Henry—the Heir of the French Monarchy? In that unfortunate Prince, wonderfully preſerved amidſt ſo many dangers, but ſtill waſting his youthful days in gloomy confinement, behold your LIEGE SOVEREIGN! Render to him the homage of your hearts, and thank Heaven that you may ſtill hope to expiate, in the perſon of the Son,* the injuries of the Father. Thus, by

* See Note (A.) reſpecting this unfortunate Prince; p. 263.

returning

returning to the paths of duty and allegiance, may you yet eſcape from the miſeries you now ſuffer, and lay a foundation for your future happineſs.

It was thus that the Engliſh Nation, in the laſt century, eſcaped from the oppreſſions of Tyranny and the horrors of Anarchy. It was thus that they regained the bleſſings of order, and prepared that high ſtate of felicity which they have ſince enjoyed, and ſtill enjoy. It was thus that they ſought to purify themſelves from the foul ſtain of Treaſon, conſummated, as in France, by the crime of Regicide: a crime, which they ſtill ſeek to expiate, by contrite and ſolemn devotion, whenever the revolving day, the blackeſt in their Annals, reproaches them with the atrocious deed. The miſeries of their intermediate ſituation bore, indeed, no compariſon to thoſe now endured by France; but they found no aſylum, except in the reſtoration of their lawful Government. They were too wiſe to clog and embarraſs that Reſtoration by new and fanciful reſtrictions on the Regal Power, knowing that by ſo doing they would only have retarded the return of order and tranquillity, and have opened a ſource for ſubſequent contention. They knew that it was not then the moment to introduce any improvements into the adminiſtration of their Government. The experience of Revolutions (for they too had ſeveral during the

ſubverſion

ſubverſion of their Monarchy), had taught them, that the object of the firſt importance and neceſſity was to reſtore things to their ancient ſtate —they therefore, inſtead of endeavouring to compromiſe with the Royal Authority, reſtored the Son to the Throne of his Father, and truſted to the good ſenſe of future, and more ſettled times, to eſtabliſh ſuch checks or correctives, as experience might point out to be neceſſary. They were ſpeedily rewarded; for the very ſame reign produced the famous Habeas Corpus Act—that grand Bulwark of Engliſh Liberty—that ſecond Magna Charta, ſcarcely inferior to the firſt in value and importance.

THE DAY that France ſhall imitate the above example, ſo ſtrongly recommended by its reſult, will be a great, a glorious, and a happy day for that Country. France will have abundant reaſon to rejoice on that day, which ſhall ſee the Son, in like manner, aſcend the Throne of the Father. Not that Conſtitutional Throne, whence the Father, after being depoſed from his lawful authority, was led to the ſcaffold, nor any other Throne erected on the airy baſis of ſpeculation, and which would but enſure to him the fate of his SIRE—but the Throne of his Anceſtors—there to govern, not deſpotically, but according to known and fundamental laws, and in connection with the intermediate and ſubordinate powers eſſential to the Conſtitution.

But in order to produce the deſired benefit, or indeed any benefit, from a Reſtoration, the Royal Authority muſt, as in England, be reſtored intire—ſuch as it was previous to its ſubverſion. Were it to be reſumed with enfeebled force, how could it reduce ſuch a chaos into order—how prevent the jarring elements from again ruſhing forth, and throwing all into confuſion. Beſides, where reſides the right to impair its energy and curtail its prerogatives? Have foreign Powers ſuch a right, or can it belong to the unprincipled regicides who have uſurped, or to any other faction which may yet ſucceed them in uſurping, the dominion? Until the legitimate Authority be replaced, no lawful act can be done. It is impoſſible to confer what is not poſſeſſed; and only a Power that is legal can give legitimacy to its proceedings. Whatever proceeds from the Revolution muſt be eſſentially invalid. Whatever is derived from ſuch a ſource ſhould be rejected with ſcorn. Even an advantage, however ſpecious, however valuable in itſelf, would, if obtained by ſuch means, ceaſe to be a benefit, and actually become an evil. It would be the offspring of crime. It would be a ſcyon of the Revolution, and could produce only corrupt and poiſonous fruit. It would be the germ of future Revolutions. Were it poſſible for France to obtain, in that way, the moſt perfect theoretical form of Government, (a ſuppoſition truly chimerical), it would,

would, in effect, be the moſt grievous misfortune. Being acquired by a Revolution, its apparent excellence would only recommend the practice of Revolutions, and cauſe them to become eaſy; it would unſettle men's minds, and render them viſionary; for though nature has impoſed inſuperable limits on *practical* perfection, *ſpeculative* perfection knows no bounds but thoſe of fancy and caprice.

The experience of the Revolution is ſurely not calculated to recommend, either the repetition of any plan by which it has been diſtinguiſhed, or the experiment of any new ſpeculation. It is the ancient Government, under which France arrived, in the long ſucceſſion of ages, at the height of proſperity, which is alone applicable to that Country—it is that alone which preſents any diſtinct or ſpecific object to the mind. Suppoſing any other ſyſtem to be attempted, to what ſtandard is it to be brought? To whoſe opinion is it to be referred, in order to aſcertain its nature, its limitations, or its extent? By what authority is it to be eſtabliſhed? Alas! who cannot ſee that the very attempt would tend only to prolong contention and perpetuate uncertainty? Suppoſing that any newly contrived ſyſtem of Conſtitutional Royalty, inſtead of the genuine Monarchy of France, were to be reſorted to, how long could it be expected to endure? What

foun-

foundation could it have, capable of ſupporting it? What could recommend it but the caprice of the day? What could protect it againſt the caprice of the morrow? This would ſtill be Anarchy, although its hideous features might wear a momentary and an inſidious ſmile. Even the calm which might be thus produced, would itſelf denote, in horrid gloom, the returning tempeſt.

It is impoſſible, therefore, for any truth to be better ſupported, by reaſon and experience, than this—That no durable Government can be eſtabliſhed in France, except upon the baſis of its ancient Conſtitution. That Conſtitution, which has its roots deep-ſtricken in antiquity, can alone afford a firm and ſolid foundation for order, tranquillity, and permanent authority. It is, perhaps, on a *general* conviction of this truth, and on the conduct which ſuch a conviction would produce, that depends the eſcape of mankind from the ruin, with which they are menaced. But although every friend to peace and humanity would rejoice at the reſtoration of the lawful Government of France, the apparent difficulty of bringing about that event may, perhaps, diſcourage from the undertaking. That it may be difficult of accompliſhment is extremely probable—but it ſhould be remembered, that to eſtabliſh any other ſyſtem is impoſſible. The experience of

fourteen Centuries has proved *that* Government to be applicable to France. The ſame experience, corroborated ſince by *that* ſo dearly purchaſed in the laſt five years, proves that no other is practicable in that country. Nor is the difficulty of reſtoring it ſo great as it may appear to be. Habits, manners, attachments, prejudices,—thoſe nerves and ſinews of all human inſtitutions—have been formed upon this model. It is true, they have ſuffered a temporary interruption. But they are engraven on the hearts and minds of the people; and they may, perhaps, reſume their ſway with more influence than ever. The ſufferings that have accompanied their abſence, muſt render their return doubly welcome. No attachment is ſo ſtrong as an ancient one, when renewed after a ſuſpenſion, particularly if that ſuſpenſion has been productive of miſery. Whatever may be inſinuated to the contrary, by thoſe who wiſh to caſt an odium on every condition of *orderly* ſociety, the people of France were diſtinguiſhed as a contented and happy people—attached to their Monarchy, their Religion, their Laws, and their Magiſtrates; and it will be infinitely more eaſy for them to reſume theſe attachments, under which they became flouriſhing and reſpectable, than to form new ones, that ſhall be in any degree permanent. They will never poſſeſs ſtability until they quit their inconſtancy, and return to their ancient and orderly habits of life.

BUT THE DAY, that ſhall witneſs the re-eſtabliſhment of the French Monarchy, will be ſcarcely more auſpicious to France, than to the reſt of Europe, to Society, and to Humanity. IT will be to mankind a day of eſcape from dangers, infinitely more dreadful than have ever been either realized in fact, or apprehended in idea. IT will reſcue the human ſpecies, not merely from deſolation and ruin, but from that impending ſtate of brutal and ferocious depravity, into which human nature muſt be reduced, when releaſed from every tie, ſocial, moral, and religious—from every reſtraint of order and good government. IT will ſecure the energy of Laws—the rights of Property—and the influence of Religion. IT will reſtore ſtability to States, ſecurity to lawful Government, and peace to Nations. Not that it will relieve the world intirely from the calamity of War, for it will not root out the paſſions and infirmities of human nature, which, while the world laſts, will occaſionally involve States, as well as individuals, in contention; the political, as well as the natural world, muſt ever be ſubject to ſtorms: but it will put a ſtop to a War, differing as much from all other Wars, as the furious conflict of elements, attending the diſſolution of nature, differs from a common hurricane or earthquake—a War which employs means infinitely more dreadful than fire and ſword—which purſues an object inexpreſſibly more calamitous than conqueſt and ſubjection—a

War which admits of no compromiſe—which no ſubmiſſion, no ſacrifice can aſſuage—and which, beſides carrying in its train, with unſpeakable aggravation, all the miſeries that the moſt cruel Wars have ever produced, is itſelf but an auxiliary to Anarchy, and aims at nothing leſs than the total diſorganization of civilized Society.

Nothing can, in all human probability, avert ſuch a cataſtrophe but the event above alluded to—the firm and ſecure re-eſtabliſhment of the French Monarchy; for nothing elſe can extinguiſh the tremendous Volcano, which convulſes the ſocial fabric to its deepeſt foundations. Any other form of Government, introduced into France, any novel ſpecies of Conſtitutional Royalty, would but cover this Volcano for a moment, and upon the ſlighteſt eruption would totally diſappear, and, like the Conſtitution of 1789, "leave not a wreck behind." It is, therefore, the indiſpenſible duty of the Coaleſced Powers not to ſuffer themſelves to be deluded by ſuch ideal phantoms; but, as the guardians of Society, to direct all their attention, and to exert all their wiſdom and ability, to accelerate an event, on which *alone* they can depend for the return of ſafety. Every motive that can and ought to influence them—Honour—Humanity—and Juſtice—as well as intereſt and policy (in a limited ſenſe),—call upon them, not only to purſue this object with unremitting ardour, but

OPENLY

OPENLY AND MANFULLY TO AVOW IT.—HONOUR—for it is impoſſible, by any other means, even to free their conduct from the ſuſpicion of being governed by baſe and *intereſted* views.—HUMANITY—for never was the happineſs of man ſo extenſively concerned in any event, ſince the commencement of the Chriſtian ÆRA;—that ſacred Epoch, which has been diſmiſſed from the Calendar of French Democratical Infidels, no leſs eager to inſult the Majeſty of Heaven, than his Vicegerents on Earth.—JUSTICE—that eſſence of all moral virtue, that only firm and ſolid bond of the ſocial union—calls likewiſe upon them, in the moſt ſolemn manner, to aſſert its cauſe, to vindicate its rights, and to avenge its atrocious wrongs. Violated, in all its principles, by the French Revolution, it demands redreſs for the unparalleled injuries it has thereby ſuſtained, as the only condition, on which it will continue to bleſs Society with its benign and ſalutary influence. It invokes every Sovereign to give his aid in reſtoring the rights of that Government, which involves, in its fate, both the political and ſocial rights of mankind, throughout the reſt of the World! Whatever the Poets may have feigned, ASTRÆA never attempted to quit this Earth till the breaking out of the French Revolution. Then it was, that feeling her Empire really ſhaken, ſhe prepared to depart; and ſhe waits only the event of that Revolution,

either to reſume her terreſtrial abode, or to abandon it for ever.

THE call of Honour, Humanity, and Juſtice, on the Combined Powers, to aſſiſt in raiſing up the fallen Monarchy of France, being ſo powerful, it ſurely cannot be neceſſary to enforce it by a reference to motives of intereſt or policy. It would be to preſume the abſence, not only of all rectitude and virtue, but of all wiſdom and diſcernment, to ſuppoſe, that, in a caſe ſo clear, thoſe Powers can conceive their real intereſt and ſound policy to lie in other paths, than thoſe of Honour, Humanity, and Juſtice. Were it poſſible, however, that any potentate ſhould conſult only the narrow rules of ſelfiſh intereſt and ſordid policy, can it eſcape the obſervation of the Houſes of HANOVER, of AUSTRIA, of BRANDENBURGH, of ORANGE, and of the other Powers engaged in the cauſe, that their fates, collectively and individually, depend on that of the Houſe of BOURBON? France has long been ſenſible of this truth, and has been proclaiming it aloud throughout the Revolution. The owners of ſeveral eſtates ſituated in the ſame neighbourhood, holden under the ſame tenure, and derived originally from the ſame title, would be all juſtly alarmed, if the right of any one of them were to be attacked upon a principle, which, if eſtabliſhed, would equally affect them all. They would

would ſurely find it their intereſt to make common cauſe, and to join in repelling the attack, in the firſt inſtance, without waiting ſeverally till their own turn ſhould come, and their means of defence be diminiſhed, by the ſucceſs of their adverſary in the original conteſt. This is the caſe with the Powers of Europe, except that their rights were not obliquely, but directly and openly invaded by the Revolution in France. They were all put in iſſue at the ſame time, and formal notice was given of the claim. None of thoſe Powers—no lawful Government whatever, has, or can have, any better title to Sovereignty than *that* by which *Louis XVI.* held his Crown; nor, unleſs violence and injuſtice can deſtroy right, than *that* which has deſcended upon his Heir. Until this title ſhall triumph over the principles by which it was attacked, the title of no lawful Government will be ſecure. That thoſe Powers have not, to this moment, formally recognized this title (connected as it is with their own), and declared their determination to ſupport it, is the moſt aſtoniſhing circumſtance attending the War; and is alſo the real cauſe of its unparalleled diſaſters, and of its continuance.

To account for this wonderful omiſſion is a taſk as painful as it is difficult. But it is a truth which deſerves their ſerious conſideration, that every day in which they neglect to announce ſuch

a recognition, their cauſe becomes weaker, and their chance, not merely of ſucceſs, but of eſcape, more doubtful. Every hour—every event—brings them a freſh and ſolemn warning, to delay no longer an explicit Declaration in favour of the young King and the Regent of France, as the only teſt, in their power to give, of their honourable intentions with reſpect to that Country. Late as it now would be, ſuch a Declaration could hardly fail inſtantly to produce the moſt beneficial conſequences. It would be more than equivalent to the moſt brilliant victories, and to the moſt powerful acceſſions of force. Its appearance would be like the riſing of the ſun upon their cauſe, which would become progreſſively more bright, until it ſhone in the full luſtre of meridian ſucceſs. While they neglect a meaſure of ſuch indiſpenſable juſtice, they have no right to expect the bleſſing of Providence on their arms. It is even neceſſary, in order to produce among the Allies that harmonious co-operation, which finds ſo many impediments in an extenſive Confederacy, by uniting their views and directing their efforts to one common object. It is impoſſible that they ſhould co-operate cordially and effectually, unleſs they have the ſame ultimate deſign, and unleſs they convince each other that this is the caſe. Otherwiſe, they will draw different ways, and, inſtead of aſſiſting, they will counteract, ſuſpect, and diſappoint each other.

It

It is equally impoſſible that they ſhould unite in the purſuit of any other object than that, which ſuch a Declaration would avow. The reſtoration of the Monarchy of France is the only preciſe and ſpecific object, which can be preſented to the minds, either of the Powers of Europe, or of the French People, as a termination of the calamities which diſtreſs the one, and which afflict, menace, and endanger the other. Diſtinct from this object, no two perſons, either in or out of France, agree in any definite and detailed plan. Nor can it be ſaid that any individual is prepared with any thing more preciſe on this ſubject, than the moſt vague and ambiguous terms; ſuch as, *a limited or mixed Monarchy; a Conſtitutional Royalty;* and the like: terms, which convey very different ideas to different minds, and which can have no diſtinct meaning *à priori*, but only when actually applied to, and explained, by a ſubſiſting and eſtabliſhed order of things. If a party of travellers were to miſs their way, and find themſelves in a wood or wild, beſet with numberleſs and imminent dangers, ſhould they be fortunate enough to diſcover a beaten road, leading to a place of *known* ſecurity, can it be ſuppoſed that they would prefer the faint traces of dubious tracks, affording no ground of conjecture whither they tend? If, therefore, the Confederate Powers would travel together, aiding and ſupporting each other,

other, until they ſhall be ſafe from the unprecedented dangers which ſurround them, and which have compelled them to unite in their common defence, let them take the only plain and obvious path preſenting itſelf to their view, and conducting to a ſituation, which long experience has proved to be ſecure, and which, in their preſent circumſtances, it would be their greateſt happineſs to regain.

By a ſolemn and expreſs Declaration to the effect above deſcribed, the Allied Powers would cement their union—ſtrengthen their mutual confidence—diſpel the enervating miſts of jealouſy and diſtruſt—and, by pledging themſelves to each other, and to the world, that their views are as preciſe, uniform and conſiſtent, as they are juſt and honourable, they would greatly facilitate the attainment of their object, and, at the ſame time, engage the cordial wiſhes of every honeſt and feeling mind in their favour. Let not thoſe object, who, anxious for the future liberties of France, cannot be reconciled to the idea of reſtoring the former abuſes of its Government. Thoſe abuſes were not of the ſubſtance of the Conſtitution, but corruptions of and deviations from it: they were the wild ſhoots which, for want of proper care, and being foſtered by a corruption of manners, became luxuriant in a ſtate of proſperity; and experience will ſuggeſt checks and preventions which

which will be beſt calculated to prevent their revival.* But, at all events, this is not the moment to raiſe difficulties of ſuch a nature, or of any nature. What mariner, in a violent ſtorm, would object to the ſhip being ſteered into port, becauſe ſhe had not undergone a complete repair? If repairs be wanting, they will be beſt made—nay, they can alone be made—after the veſſel ſhall have eſcaped from the tempeſtuous ſea, and been brought into a ſafe and commodious haven.

But

* It is a truth which cannot be inculcated too often, that the imperfections attending the adminiſtration of even the beſt Government, muſt ever bear a proportion to the corruption and depravity of manners prevailing among the people. If men were perfect beings, free from every evil propenſity, deſtitute of frailty and of vice, and having their paſſions always in ſubjection to their reaſon, they would ſcarcely ſtand in need of any Government at all. But, being quite the reverſe in all theſe reſpects, they require the ſtrong hand of reſtraint, and can live only in ſubjection to laws, and to thoſe, by whom laws are made. The more their habits and their manners are corrupted, the greater reſtraints are neceſſary, the leſs qualified will they be for freedom, and the more defective muſt be the energy and operation of good Government. This principle not only enables us to trace political abuſes to their real ſource, but alſo to diſcover the moſt effectual means of correcting them. As the degree of political perfection, happineſs, and liberty, depends ſo much upon the ſtate of public manners, it is evident that the beſt and moſt ſalutary kind of reform, and that, which is alone likely to be efficacious, in checking the abuſes and corruptions attending the exerciſe of Government, is to purify the manners

But a ſtill more important benefit would reſult from ſuch a Declaration (as has been already ſuggeſted in the "Reflections, &c." before publiſhed by the Author), by its exciting the confidence of the French People themſelves, and inducing them to look upon the Allied Powers, not as their conquerors, but their deliverers. Thus would the moſt effectual aſſiſtance be obtained, in favour of the Combined Arms—an aſſiſtance, without which,

manners of the people; to confirm their habits of regularity, temperance, and induſtry; to ſtrengthen the influence of virtue, and to invigorate thoſe inſtitutions, moral, and religious, which are deſigned to produce ſuch effects. The extremely corrupted ſtate of manners in France, was the main ſpring of the abuſes of its Government; and it would be poſſible for a ſimilar cauſe, if carried to a like extent in England, not only to be attended with ſimilar conſequences, but to render that degree of liberty, which is ſecured to the Engliſh people by their ineſtimable Conſtitution, ruinous to themſelves, and ſubverſive of the Conſtitution itſelf. Thoſe perſons, who are deſirous of acting the part of reformers, may find abundant ſcope for utility in that character, by endeavouring to oppoſe the baneful progreſs, and to check the contagious influence, of vice, diſſoluteneſs, and irreligion. By employing all the means in their power to correct the manners of the age, they will apply a remedy, as efficacious as it is ſafe and eaſy, to the abuſes which, more or leſs, are inſeparable from a ſtate of ſociety; a remedy which is ſure, without any riſk, to palliate and relieve what it may be impoſſible intirely to cure; and which is the more valuable, becauſe all other remedies are violent in their nature, precarious in their effects, and extremely dangerous in their application.

to judge from the paſt, all the efforts of thoſe Arms will fail of complete ſucceſs. Thus, too, might occaſions be afforded for aſſiſting that People in the ſtruggles, by which they endeavour to throw off their heavy and galling yoke; and which, if that yoke were abundantly leſs heavy and galling than it is, their impatience to ſubmit much longer to an unjuſt and uſurped authority, would unavoidably produce. But, unaccompanied with ſuch a Declaration, all offers of aſſiſtance would appear ſuſpicious — and all expeditions, which might be attempted in their favour, would probably fail to effect any thing deciſive, for want of that co-operation which confidence only can produce.

EVERY occurrence of the War—every moment of its continuance—brings with it additional proof that there is no rational proſpect of reducing France to order, without the efforts of France itſelf; that is, of the People againſt their oppreſſors: and that interior aſſiſtance is neceſſary to give effect to exterior exertions.—The Allies and theſe unfortunate People are alike neceſſary to each other. The latter are ſo wedged in by an immenſe military force, and by an artfully-conſtructed ſyſtem, which has enabled, and ſtill enables, the connected profligate Few to lord it over the unconnected Many, that they cannot relieve themſelves. On the other hand, the firm,

noble,

noble, and perſevering ſtand, made by the Royaliſt party on the weſtern coaſt, embarraſſes the Conventional Tyrants more than even the Confederacy itſelf, and creates a powerful diverſion in favour of the Allies. What a juſt ſubject of lamentation is it, that two parties, who are ſo neceſſary to each other, and whoſe intereſts are preciſely the ſame, ſhould not thoroughly underſtand one another, and co-operate, with confidence and harmony, in purſuit of their common object *! To effect this, the thing chiefly wanting, is to convince the Royaliſts in France, that the Combined Powers are their friends—deſirous to ſerve and to ſave them. To produce ſuch a conviction, a clear, poſitive, and unequivocal Declaration, accompa-

* That a powerful co-operation with the Royaliſts in France would have been attended with the happieſt effects, appears from the teſtimony of the Republican General Danican, who was employed by the Convention againſt the Royaliſts in La Vendée. That general, in his "Banditti unmaſked," ſpeaking of Quiberon, where the expedition, which had been concerted to favour the Royaliſts, failed through the treachery of the French priſoners, who had enliſted in the Royal cauſe, ſays,

"There the means of ſucceſs preſented themſelves on all "ſides; abundance of ammunition, arms, money, troops, "the well-known devotion of the Bretons, revolts at Paris, "a dreadful famine in the heart of France, a general con-"tempt of the Government, every thing ſeemed to unite for "the purpoſe of enſuring ſucceſs to the Royaliſts; and if, at "at this epoch, they had obtained one ſignal advantage, all "France would have declared in their favour."—*Note to the Collection.*

 nied

nied with ſuch acts as are calculated to prove it ſincere, is indiſpenſably neceſſary. Such a Declaration, ſo accompanied, would gain the hearts, not merely of the Royaliſts in *arms*, but of all thoſe, who are awed into ſilence, and concealment of their real ſentiments—of all who bewail, in ſecret, the murder of their King, and the captivity of his lawful Heir—of all who ſigh after the Religion of their anceſtors, and who deplore the unutterable miſery of their ſituation. How numerous this party may be—how ſoon, when emboldened by their confidence in foreign Powers, and their hope of foreign aid, they may rally and effect their deliverance, and with it the eſcape of Europe and of Society—who will pretend to decide?

In the mean time, nothing that activity, vigilance, forecaſt, and energy, can effect, ſhould be omitted, to crown the operations of the Allied Armies with ſucceſs. Thoſe Armies, though only a part, are a very neceſſary part of that complete chain of force, by which alone the furious and deſperate foe can be effectually bound. The Coaleſced Powers ſhould not only call forth all the reſources at their command, but alſo take care to employ them in the moſt effectual manner. They ſhould bear in mind, that, ſurrounded as they are by treachery in all its forms, intelligence and ſecrecy, thoſe grand hinges of military ſucceſs, are as much more

more difficult, as they are more important in this, than they were in any former War. It is only by decisive councils, by vigorous exertions, and by bold and daring enterprizes, that such a War is to be brought to a prosperous issue. The conduct of the Allies should also invariably mark their high sense of the justice of the cause they maintain, and their utter detestation of that they oppose; and it should inspire like sentiments into every breast. They should promote, by all the means in their power, and every *real* friend to Humanity will assist them in promoting, a *moral* influence, in aid of their *physical* force, to combat the pernicious influence of those principles, by which the enemy seeks their ruin and that of Society. They owe it to themselves, and to all who fight under their banners, not to forget, that retaliation is one of the most just and necessary principles, in the military code of civilized nations; that it is particularly necessary to keep such a foe in awe; and that a neglect to enforce it is sure to be regarded as an indication of fear, and to produce the sacrifice of all title to respect. But particularly ought the Powers engaged in the present War to enforce, in their armies, the strictest attention to discipline, and the most regular and prompt obedience. They should punish every deviation in these respects with the strictest severity, remembering, that just and well-timed examples are, in effect, the greatest lenity, and often

the

the very ſoul of military energy. The great and glorious ſucceſſes, which attended the Britiſh arms in the war of 1756, have been aſcribed to nothing ſo much, as to the effect of the example of ſeverity, exhibited in the perſon of Admiral Byng: an example, which inſtantly turned the current of adverſity, and continued, during the whole War, to produce the moſt happy conſequences. In a War like the preſent, where ſo much is at ſtake, where every thing, juſtly dear to man, depends upon ſucceſs, no fault, no neglect can be venial; and the omiſſion to puniſh, upon proper occaſions, is, if poſſible, more criminal than the offence which calls for puniſhment.

The idea that, in any inſtance, the nobleſt cauſe that ever brought Armies in the field, has ſuffered by treachery, is too painful to be admitted without the ſtrongeſt proof. And yet, without ſuch a ſuppoſition, injurious as it is to honour and loyalty,—to every virtue ſocial and military,—how are we to account for the ſurrender of places of immenſe ſtrength, almoſt without an attempt at defence? After ſuch diſgraceful ſurrenders, the delay of rigid inquiry is highly prejudicial to the general cauſe.

It ſhould not be forgotten by the Combined Powers, that all their exertions to oppoſe the arms

of Republican France will be of no avail, unleſs they hold themſelves conſtantly on their guard againſt the inſidious and treacherous arts of their unprincipled foe. The ſame means which ſucceeded in France, are employed in almoſt every other European State, to foment internal commotions, and to bring about a general inſurrection and revolution. Theſe engines will not ceaſe to be employed, ſo long as the grand ſpring of French Anarchy ſhall continue in motion. The greateſt and moſt unremitting watchfulneſs is neceſſary to prevent their ſucceſs.

Among the numerous artifices, againſt which it is neceſſary to guard, is one which it is, moſt obviouſly, the intereſt of the Convention to employ, and which, indeed, it ſcarcely takes any pains to conceal, *that* of endeavouring to break the ſubſiſting Confederacy. One would think, that a warning againſt this artifice, were an inſult on the ſenſe and the ſpirit of the Powers, of which that Confederacy is compoſed. But when no caution ſhould be neglected, no admonition ought to be deſpiſed; and the inceſſant cry of Peace, with which Europe is made to reſound, ought to excite the moſt ſerious alarms. It is not that there is the leaſt ground to apprehend the atrocious farce of a *general* Peace. Did there exiſt no other impediment to ſuch a traiterous agreement (for traiterous it would be on both ſides), the diſcernment, ſpirit,

ſpirit, and energy of Great Britain, who, to her immortal honour, is the ſoul and the cement of the Confederacy, would alone ſuffice to prevent its taking place. Great Britain, who has never been accuſtomed to think of peace, when ſhe could not dictate terms that were honourable, will not now, for the firſt time, (although ſome of her ſons may be ſo degenerate as to pronounce the timid and diſgraceful word), ſhrink from a conteſt in which ſhe knows that neither her ſafety nor her honour can be preſerved, unleſs her adverſary be ſubdued. Engliſhmen will not forget, that their Hiſtory ſtands fair at preſent, and that they can look back on their political tranſactions, with the reſt of Europe, without a bluſh. Nor will they their annals, but leave, to their poſterity, their inheritance of honour, as intire, and as valuable (at leaſt), as they received it from their anceſtors.

Of this the Convention is ſo well convinced, as to abandon all pacific views with reſpect to this country, and to avow the deſtruction of the Britiſh Government, and the extinction of Britiſh freedom and independence, to be its grand and predominant objects. It ſeems, however, to have greater hopes of deluding others of the Allies into a ſurrender of their honour and ſecurity; and it will certainly ſpare no pains, and neglect no artifice, to detach as many of them as poſſible from the Coalition.

But can it eſcape the notice of any part of that Coalition, however preſſed for the moment, that France can have no other object in endeavouring to make a ſeparate Peace, than to purſue, with more eaſe and effect, her plans of univerſal conqueſt and devaſtation; that ſhe would grant peace to no regular Government, but in order to make the deſtruction of all regular Governments more certain; that ſhe would ſuſpend her operations againſt no one of the Combined Powers, with any other view, than to be the better enabled to cruſh them all, by the aid of *their* force, who ſhould thus become the dupes of her intrigue and perfidy; that her obvious policy is to adopt and enforce the maxim, *divide et impera*; and that ſhe would never entertain an idea, or liſten to the propoſal of pacification, if ſhe did not feel, like the inſidious ſurvivor of the Roman Combatants, when oppoſed to his three bleeding antagoniſts, that it is impoſſible for her to prevail, unleſs ſhe can ſeparate her opponents, in order to ſubdue them one after another? Let ſuch of the Powers as may harbour an idea of a ſeparate Peace aſk themſelves, if, by withdrawing from the Confederacy, they ſhould enable France to overpower the reſt of the Allies, what they will have to oppoſe to her incurſions and ravages, when their turn ſhall arrive (as arrive it will), to be attacked ſingly and unſupported. Or let them conſider how, in caſe ſuch a cataſtrophe ſhould be averted,

they will ever be able to hold up their heads again among the Nations. How will they wipe off the diſgrace of having abandoned the cauſe of Society, when at the criſis of its fate? If any of them, enervated by commerce and wealth, by avarice and eaſe, ſhould chooſe rather to incur ſuch diſhonour than to rouſe themſelves to exertion—if they would riſk their national independence, rather than drag forth their HOARDS of paltry pelf*—who would not ſpurn at the ſtate of affluence, which had produced ſo inglorious a diſpoſition? who would not prefer thereto the rough and uncultivated ſimplicity, the manly hardihood of the Barbarian, who knows how to die, but knows not how to yield?

BUT whatever may be the conduct of other countries—ſuppoſing, (however improbable the ſuppoſition), that Great Britain ſhould, with all the ardour of her zeal, and with all the brilliancy of her example, be unable to hold the Confederacy together, until its important object be attained, and be finally left alone in the conteſt—ſtill Britons will contend, ſingly and manfully, for their rights, and for thoſe of Humanity. They will ſupply, by their own energy, the want of foreign aſſiſtance. They will ſpurn at all thoughts of Peace until, being compatible with honour and ſecurity, it may afford a rational proſpect of ſta-

* The United Provinces.

bility. They will ſhow, as their anceſtors have often ſhown, that Britiſh ardour and courage derive freſh luſtre from difficulty, and ſhine brighteſt in adverſity. In the midſt of all their difficulties, they will maintain that Naval Pre-eminence, on which alone they can depend for ſecurity—which is their natural inheritance—and which *may* prove the ultimate reſource of civilized ſociety. They will look towards the Ocean, as the grand ſcene of their efforts and their glory—as the main bulwark of their ſafety. Inſtead of purſuing the vain chimera of an unſubſtantial and perfidious Peace, they will make it their indiſpenſable object, TO CRUSH THE NAVY OF REPUBLICAN FRANCE. To this great object they will direct their vaſt reſources, conſidering it as their only ſafe dependence for an honourable, a ſolid, and a permanent Peace; a Peace conſiſtent with ſecurity, and at which they ſhall have no occaſion to bluſh. The glorious Firſt of June points out to them the path to victory. It is on their native element that they will retrieve the diſaſters of the War, and crown it with complete ſucceſs. It is there that they will make the courage and enthuſiaſm of the Nation flow in their natural channel. It is there that, while they maintain and perpetuate the ancient Liberties of Engliſhmen, they will refute the modern French ſyſtem of Liberty and Equality, and quench, in the mighty deep, the diſorganizing ſpirit of Anarchy.

archy. It is there that they will wield the trident of Neptune, and, by its potent aid, confirm the ſceptre of Royalty. It is there, in ſhort, that, relying on the approbation of Providence on their exertions, they will *conquer*—and, CONQUERING, ſpeak PEACE TO THE WORLD.

## (A) Note to page 236.

The young Prince, who, on the death of Lewis XVI. became intitled to the crown of France, and who, like that Monarch, was incarcerated in his dominions, ſoon terminated his unfortunate career. This intereſting Prince, whoſe tender age, whoſe cruel fate, whoſe premature misfortunes filled all Europe with anxious ſolicitude, was ſoon added to the numberleſs victims of a Revolution, which has ſpared neither age, nor ſex, nor rank. The Crown ſoon paſſed from that juvenile head, over which it was a while ſuſpended, without ever touching thoſe brows, on which every friend to Humanity was impatient to ſee it fixed. The rightful owner of that Crown quitted a world, in which he had ſcarcely known any thing but ſorrow, without receiving the homage of his loyal ſubjects; who, overwhelmed by the moſt cruel oppreſſion, were conſtrained to conceal within their boſoms, or to vent only by ſtealth, their ardent wiſhes for the ſafety of his perſon, and the re-eſtabliſhment of his throne. The life of this much-injured Prince will occupy a melancholy portion of the hiſtory of France—a mournful ſpace in the Dynaſty of its Kings. But who ſhall relate the ſufferings he has undergone? Who ſhall deſcribe the ſeverities and indignities he has ſuſtained? Carefully ſecluded from the public eye, and altogether at the mercy of the moſt inhuman monſters—deprived not only of every privilege of his birth, but

alſo of every care due to his tender age—expoſed to the rage and malice of brutal ferocity, as well as to the injurious conſequences of unfeeling neglect—without one friend to alleviate his hardſhips, to inſpire him with principles of virtue, or to ſolace him with the comforts of religion—ſurrounded only by wretches, whoſe delight it was to vitiate his mind and enervate his body, that he might exhibit a ſpectacle of contempt in caſe he ſhould, in the ſtrange viciſſitude of human affairs, be hereafter ſeated on the Throne of his Anceſtors—at length, a prey to the helliſh arts of thoſe infamous Regicides, whoſe hands were ſtill reeking with the blood of his Royal Sire, and who, with a guilt not to be paralleled in hiſtory, have murdered two Sovereigns in immediate ſucceſſion.

The Crown of France has, by theſe reiterated Treaſons, devolved on a Prince of mature age, and at full liberty, whoſe title is as clear and indiſputable as that of any Sovereign in Europe to his Diadem. The death of Lewis XVII. is the eſcape of the Monarch and the Crown. And the Powers of Europe have now an opportunity to ſupport, in an effectual manner, thoſe rights, the eſtabliſhment of which can alone preſerve their own Thrones from a ſpeedy overthrow.—Note to the Collection.

9 DE 63

# THOUGHTS

ON

# *THE ORIGIN AND FORMATION*

OF

# POLITICAL CONSTITUTIONS:

SUGGESTED BY

## THE RECENT ATTEMPT TO FRAME

ANOTHER

## *NEW CONSTITUTION FOR FRANCE.*

There cannot be done a greater miſchief to Prince and People than the propagating falſe notions concerning Government.

LOCKE.

PUBLISHED IN 1796.

BRITISH MUSEUM

# THOUGHTS

ON

## *THE ORIGIN AND FORMATION*

OF

## POLITICAL CONSTITUTIONS.

THE oppreſſors of France, in order to prop up their tottering tyranny, have, it ſeems, found it neceſſary to fabricate *another* NEW CONSTITUTION, for their miſerable and diſtracted Country. Thoſe Revolutionary dreams, which had before been dignified by the name of Conſtitutions, and which, after holding forth the moſt ſplendid promiſes of happineſs and liberty, were productive only of ruin and ſlavery, had intirely vaniſhed, and were ſucceeded by a kind of anarchical Dictatorſhip, which, in the new Jargon, was termed a Revolutionary Government, and a *proviſional ſtate of things*. It was not only intended, but the intention was avowed, that this *State* ſhould continue during the War; and a

*term*

*term* ſo indefinite was propoſed, that the ruling factions might, without interruption, purſue their ſchemes of ambition. But after a ſufficient trial, thoſe factions diſcovered that, during the contention in which they were engaged among themſelves, they were collectively loſing ground,—that their power, inſtead of being confirmed, became weaker and weaker every day—and that they were obliged, at length, to abandon that ſyſtem of terror, in which they had cordially and unanimouſly concurred, and to affect a moderation, which was as foreign from their hearts, as it was repugnant to their principles and objects: finding that their *proviſional ſtate of things* was attended with ſuch conſequences, they were compelled to change their plan, and to bring forward a more regular ſyſtem of diſorder.

To ſuch cauſes may be aſcribed the repetition of that national Farce, a NEW CONSTITUTION, which has been revived and again brought on the ſtage, to divert the attention of the people from their ſufferings,—from the injuſtice, uſurpation and tyranny of thoſe, by whom their ſufferings have been produced—and from the force of thoſe lawful claims, which their duty and their happineſs require them to acknowledge, and which, to theſe unprincipled uſurpers, are rendered ſtill more formidable, by the liberty of the Prince on whom they are now devolved.

By

By ſuch arts have the French Revolutioniſts been enabled to produce and to prolong the misfortunes of their Country. Under the ſpecious pretext of giving to France a New Conſtitution, they firſt ſucceeded in overthrowing a Monarchy, which had ſubſiſted for ages, and, on every critical and urgent occaſion, they reſort to the ſame artifice, in order to keep alive the expectation of a credulous and ſanguine people, by perſuading them, in ſpite of ſo much experience to the contrary, that the Revolution is ſtill capable of producing their felicity. The ſyſtem of Anarchy, which has been raiſed on the ruins of regular Government, would expire of itſelf, if it were not thus fed and renovated by *new* Conſtitutions; which, like returning Comets, ſupply it, from time to time, with freſh fuel, and thereby preſerve it from utter extinction.

It would be a waſte of time to analyze the new Conſtitutional Code, which conſiſts of a mere jumble of incongruous parts, connected by no common tie, regulated by no main ſpring, totally deſtitute of unity and coheſion, and as inapplicable to each other, as they are to the Country to which they are meant to be applied. But ſuch defects are unworthy the attention of Conſtitution-mongers, who, in their rage for ſpeculation and novelty, ſeem to think that even

nature

nature herſelf can be ſubjected to their wild and frantic theories.

Such a machine is clearly not calculated for duration, even though it were not erected upon an illegitimate baſis, and conſtructed upon thoſe diſorganizing principles, which are incompatible with ſtable Government and orderly ſociety. In ſome reſpects, indeed, the new plan apparently differs from the preceding ones, as it exhibits a more feaſible attempt to veſt, both power and property, in the uſurping and rapacious hands, by which they have been ſeized. For this purpoſe it profeſſes to reject the ſyſtem of equality as a chimera of the brain;—it affects to recognize the ſacredneſs of property, (a principle, which it was the intereſt of the preſent poſſeſſors to diſclaim, until their peculations were complete);—and, by confining the privileges of citizenſhip to thoſe, who pay direct contributions, it endeavours to keep the inferior claſſes of ſociety from the exerciſe of thoſe pretended political rights, to which, in principle, it acknowledges them to be intitled, but which, (as its framers well knew,) they can never exerciſe, except for the purpoſe of overturning the ſubſiſting Government, whatever it may be. Theſe regulations, when viewed by themſelves, might ſeem to indicate a diſpoſition to eſtabliſh ſomething like order and ſettled authority; and they were accordingly oppoſed by that unceaſing

ceaſing advocate for Anarchy, that inextinguiſhable firebrand, Thomas Paine; who could not endure the idea, that even his aſſociates in wickedneſs ſhould quietly enjoy the fruit of their crimes. But there was little reaſon to apprehend any ſuch conſequences, from the introduction of theſe Revolutionary variations into the ſyſtem now propoſed. The framers of that ſyſtem, would, doubtleſs, have been glad to fix themſelves in the ſeat of power, by a more ſimple proceſs, and to renounce intirely thoſe principles of Anarchy, which form the ſubſtance of their Code. But they had too many competitors, jealous of their aſcendancy; they were too dependent upon the influence of popular deluſion, to diſpenſe with that Jargon of the Rights of Man, and of the Sovereignty of the People, which, throughout the whole Revolution, had produced ſuch wonderful effects; and they knew that their uſurped authority would, in its genuine colours, appear too odious to be ſubmitted to for a moment.

THEY were, therefore, under the neceſſity of giving to their Code the metaphyſical varniſh, which had been found capable of veiling ſo many crimes; they prefixed to it the declaration of the Rights of Man; and they preſented to the fancy a voluminous and complex ſyſtem of Legiſlation and Government, founded upon the eſſential principles of the Revolution: a ſyſtem which it was no difficult matter to make ſpecious in theory,

theory, but which will not be reduced to practice any more than the Revolutionary vagaries of preceding aſſemblies. Theſe were the only means by which they could hope to retain, even for the moment, the aſcendancy they had gained by fraud, violence, uſurpation, and regicide; and as former Conſtitutions, of the like fabrick, had led to various ſucceſſive tyrannies, and even to that unexampled ſyſtem of tyranny and oppreſſion, eſtabliſhed by Robeſpierre, they depend upon their new Conſtitution for the production of ſimilar effects, to which the invention of a *directoral Pentarchy* is admirably calculated to contribute *.

* This event was accompliſhed by the Revolution of Sept. 4, 1797, when the Conſtitution was intirely overthrown, although its name was preſerved, in order to give an apparent ſanction to ſome of the moſt atrocious acts, and to a ſyſtem of the moſt unqualified deſpotiſm, which have diſtinguiſhed any period of the whole Revolution. On that occaſion the Jacobins obtained a complete triumph over their adverſaries, and three of the Directors, by their own authority, ſeized one of their body (the other having effected his eſcape) and ſuch of the two Councils as were obnoxious to them. While the Capital was awed, by a military force, into the moſt abject ſubmiſſion, the new Uſurpers, deſirous of keeping up the appearance of forms, convened the Councils, or rather a ſmall number of them, in a new place of ſitting, and, as may be ſuppoſed, obtained without difficulty, a Decree for the baniſhment of the arreſted perſons; who, without a trial, were crammed into cages mounted upon wheels (which the unconquerable levity of the French character has denominated *Diligences de Guiana)* and tranſported to the moſt unhealthy ſpot within the whole peſtiferous jurisdiction of the Republic.

cram-

To ſuppoſe that this Conſtitution can be eſtabliſhed, or that it can become a foundation for regular and ſtable government, would denote the groſſeſt ignorance of the nature, and, indeed, of the firſt principles of Society. It is certainly introduced under circumſtances much leſs auſpicious than thoſe which accompanied the former ones produced by the Revolution; of which *that* of 1789, in particular, had the appearance of the moſt unbounded popular enthuſiaſm in its favour. But inſtead of enthuſiaſm, the people manifeſt only coldneſs and indifference on the preſent occaſion. They have not the leaſt idea that this new ſyſtem is calculated to produce their felicity. They conſider it merely as a change; and as they are conſcious that their ſituation cannot be more deplorable than it is, they are ready to acquieſce in any change, in the faint hope that it may ultimately bring them relief. On the other hand, it is plain that the Convention framed this Conſtitution, with the ſole view of prolonging its own power, by giving to that power an appearance of novelty, and the force of a more regular and diſtinct organization. The different factions of which it is compoſed, aware of the neceſſity of a change, agreed on this ſyſtem, as a kind of compromiſe among themſelves; thinking to parcel out the Sovereignty according to the new arrangement, or, at leaſt, to ſtart again, on equal

terms, each truſting to his adroitneſs, ſtrength, and agility, to gain the prize of political contention. To attain theſe objects, one thing was neceſſary;—to ſecure their own return to the new Aſſemblies, which, under the diſguiſe of novel forms and appellations, they meant to be compoſed of themſelves, as far as their reduced numbers would ſuffice for that purpoſe. How to effect this was the difficulty. They knew that no reliance could be placed upon the voluntary choice of the people, for whom *they had laboured ſo long and ſuffered ſo much.* They had no confidence in the public gratitude, for *the great and manifold ſervices* they had rendered the State. Some more certain and effectual means were, therefore, neceſſary, and it muſt be acknowledged that they have hit upon the moſt daring expedient, ever ſuggeſted by profligacy or deſperation. They decreed that two thirds of the new Legiſlature ſhould be choſen from the preſent Convention. This decree contained, in reality, the *ſubſtance* of the new Conſtitution. The Code was only the *form*, or rather the gilding of the pill, which, otherwiſe, they feared, would not be ſwallowed by the French People; and they flattered themſelves that, by preſenting both the Decree and the Conſtitution at the ſame time, the one would facilitate the paſſage of the other.

To

To ſupport this glaring and unequivocal violation of every principle which they profeſſed to obſerve, and to guard againſt the effect, which ſuch an attempt, notwithſtanding all their arts and influence, might produce upon the minds of the people, they took care previouſly to ſecure the countenance of the army, by obtaining its acceptance both of the Conſtitution and the Decree; ſhowing thereby, in the cleareſt manner, that they were determined to go all lengths, rather than relinquiſh their ill-gotten power. According to their own report a majority of the Primary Aſſemblies has accepted the Decree, but the CAPITAL, that Mother and Nurſe of the Revolution, has rejected it by a majority of 45 to 3 of thoſe Aſſemblies. Indeed, there remains ſcarcely any doubt that the total majority, declared by the Convention in favour of the Decree, was fictitious, and that, if a fair report could have been obtained, it would have ſhown that a majority of the Primary Aſſemblies were for the rejection of the Decree. This circumſtance, however, like every other event of the Revolution, conveys an uſeful leſſon, ſuggeſting, that every attempt to realize the principle, that the people have a right to chooſe their Government, tends not only to impoſe on them a Government againſt their will, but to reduce them to the very humilitating ſituation, of being inſulted with an apparent exerciſe of a free choice,

while they are compelled to be the inſtruments of their own ſlavery, and to fix and rivet their own chains.

A STRONGER proof could not be given that the Conventional leaders were conſcious of their extreme weakneſs and inſtability, than the deſperate meaſure of calling upon the military, (which, during the whole Revolution had been blindly obſequious), to pronounce upon political queſtions. For though they had too much penetration and foreſight not to be aware, that they were incurring the danger of giving themſelves a maſter, and of introducing a military in the ſtead of a civil deſpotiſm, yet ſo critical was their ſituation, that they were glad to reſort to any means to preſerve their precarious authority; and they, doubtleſs, flattered themſelves that the appearance of ſuch ſupport would awe into ſervile acquieſcence a people, inured, during five years, to the yoke of oppreſſion, and habituated to the impulſe of terror. Their expectations of implicit ſubmiſſion are diſappointed, and, notwithſtanding their pretended majority, they meet with ſo determined a reſiſtance, that they will, probably, be obliged to compel their *Sovereign* into acquieſcence by force of arms, and to uſher in their New Conſtitution by the roaring of cannon *.

* This was literally the caſe.

WHILE

WHILE the moſt momentous events are rolling on with an impetuoſity, which no human force ſeems able to reſiſt, it is the part of wiſdom to realize the benefits of experience, as affording the only chance, either for preſent eſcape, or for future ſafety. How ſtrongly does the preſent period call upon mankind to trace effects to their cauſes, and to view, in their conſequences, the tendency of thoſe *principles*, which have, by the aid of ſpecious pretexts of improvement, and alluring profeſſions of philanthropy, been reduced to practice by the French Revolution. That Revolution exhibits, in the moſt ſtriking manner, the miſchiefs inſeparable from an application of the doctrine, that the people have a right to chooſe their Government. Of all the ſyſtems ever ſuggeſted by the folly or malignity of man, that which aſſerts the exiſtence of ſuch a right is the moſt abſurd, viſionary and ruinous. Whatever may be the language of mad ſpeculatiſts, or of wicked incendiaries, the right itſelf is abſolutely impracticable, and the attempt to exerciſe it is fraught with ruin. No people ever did, or ever can, frame their Government. The idea contains no leſs an inverſion in the order of things, than *that* of the ſervants of a Family pretending to appoint their Lord, and the children to produce their Parents: and as well might an individual, as a State, attempt to

regenerate himſelf, and to infuſe into his frame a new Conſtitution, in the ſtead of that which was beſtowed by nature, confirmed and inſenſibly modified by education and habit, and eſſentially connected with his very being.

A STATE, indeed, as well as an individual, may, by a raſh effort of deſperation, commit ſuicide, and diſſolve the ties of its exiſtence, by the ſubverſion of its Government, and the deſtruction of its Conſtitution. Happily, it is difficult intirely to extinguiſh the flame of political life; and, notwithſtanding a ſuſpenſion of the accuſtomed functions of Government, there is a latent principle, a ſtrong tendency to revivification, which impels powerfully to the reſtoration of the ancient and habitual ſtate of things. But if once the deſtruction be complete—if the ancient Government and Conſtitution be wholly and irretrievably gone, the ſtate is defunct, and cannot, any more than the individual, renovate itſelf. Its component parts may, indeed, paſs into new forms of ſocial being, but its identity is loſt. The people who have been excited to effect, by treaſon and rebellion, the total overthrow of their Government and Conſtitution, have no power whatever, of themſelves, to form new political ties, and to ſubſtitute another authority in the room of that which has been diſplaced.

Having

Having done the miſchief, their influence is at an end. What their future condition will be it is impoſſible to foreſee, but it does not at all depend upon themſelves. They may, for a conſiderable time, be the prey of anarchy, and, at length, they may be ſubjected to the iron yoke of a domeſtic, or, perhaps, a foreign tyrant; but, after being the ſport of chance, ambition, intrigue and faction, whenever they ſhall ſettle into a permanent State, the change in all their political, and civil relations, will be ſo complete, that they will be no longer collectively the ſame people, although the maſs of individuals, thoſe atoms of ſociety, may continue nearly the ſame as before *.

It is not meant to be denied that inſtances have occurred, in which a State has received a new form of Government, without undergoing an intire political transformation. But wherever this has happened, it has either been accompliſhed by the operation of a major force,

* Who will ſay that the States of Greece and Rome continue to exiſt at this day, although the ſucceſſion of inhabitants has been tranſmitted through all the intervening generations; and what is it but a change of Government and Conſtitution that has effected the wonderful transformation, which has taken place in thoſe Countries, and which renders them as different from what they once were, as the moſt diſtant and diſſimilar States are from each other.

internal or external, competent to bring about and eſtabliſh ſuch a change, or it has been the reſult of a ſucceſsful ſtruggle, by which a dependent State has enabled itſelf to throw off its foreign dependence. In the firſt caſe there has exiſted a Power, concentrated in itſelf, directed to a particular but limited object, and able to compel ſubmiſſion, and to accommodate the State to the change it was to undergo; and in the ſecond, all that remained to be done, after the acquiſition of independence, was to fill up the chaſm, which had been occaſioned by the removal of a foreign juriſdiction, and to ſubſtitute a power in the place of that which had been thrown off. In the latter caſe it ſhould alſo be remembered, that the force, by which the ſtruggle was maintained, was in poſſeſſion of ſufficient authority to prevent the ntervention of anarchy;—that *that* authority, which has invariably, in ſuch caſes, formed the baſis of the new Government, and which wanted only a more regular organization, was ſure to obtain the cheerful ſubmiſſion of the people, ever ready to pay their homage to thoſe whom they conſider as their deliverers;—and that nothing is more calculated to unite a people than a ſucceſsful endeavour to ſhake off their dependence on foreign ſway. In neither of theſe caſes, therefore, has it devolved upon the people to exerciſe

ercise the imaginary and impracticable right, ascribed to them by the disciples of the new Philosophy, of choosing their Government, and of reconstructing the edifice of Society, upon the basis of a new Constitution. The exercise of such a right was reserved for the experience of modern times, in which its advocates go the length of asserting, that the people are, at all times, intitled, by virtue of an unalienable Sovereignty, to change and new model their Government, according to their fancy, and for no other reason than because it is their pleasure so to do. And yet, strange to say, the promulgators of such principles, which strike at the very existence of Society, are neither confined as madmen, nor executed as traitors.

It should also be observed, that in the cases above referred to, where a change of Government has taken place, without producing a political dissolution, the State has not been disorganized and reduced to its elementary parts, which has been both the principle and the effect of the French Revolution. On the contrary, the change has never, in either of those cases, been carried further than was required by the necessity of the case. The Government has assumed a new form, and even its principle may, in some degree, have been varied, but the manners,

laws,

laws, cuſtoms, and ſocial inſtitutions of the Country, have been cautiouſly preſerved, and have, by their preſervation, contributed to the eſtabliſhment of the new ſyſtem of Power. Nor has even the Government itſelf experienced a total change, but has retained as much of its ancient principle, as was compatible with the modification which it underwent. In ROME the Monarchy was ſuppreſſed, but the two Orders, as far as was conſiſtent with ſuch a change, remained as before, while the State retained its laws, its ancient uſages, and its civil and religious inſtitutions, and thereby prevented the deſtruction of ſocial order.—But, notwithſtanding theſe advantages, the want of a counterpoiſe, and the abſence of a controling power, ſtrong enough to reſtrain the exceſſes of ambition, and the violence of faction, tended perpetually to the production of anarchy, and thereby created a conſtantly recurring neceſſity of foreign war, to preſerve the State from being the prey of domeſtic ſtruggles. And, at length, after numberleſs convulſions, an abſolute Deſpotiſm was eſtabliſhed, which might date its origin from the deſtruction of Kingly Power.

IN like manner, AMERICA, when ſhe became independent, retained her former laws, uſages, and civil and religious inſtitutions; and the powers of Government devolved, as a matter of

of courſe, on the General and the Aſſembly, under whoſe guidance the Country had acquired its independence, and who, (not the *people*) at their own diſcretion, framed a Conſtitution which was ſubmitted to the teſt of experience. But, notwithſtanding all theſe auxiliaries to ſocial order, favoured by the circumſtance of a ſcanty and widely diffuſed population, it was found, in the courſe of a few years, that too great a deviation from the ancient political ſyſtem tended to anarchy. In the year 1787 a new Conſtitution * was therefore framed—ſtill not by the *people*—but by the Convention, ſhut up for that purpoſe in cloſe Divan. And in *that* Conſtitution was recognized, in a ſtriking manner, the neceſſity of reverting, as far as circumſtances would allow, to the principles of the ancient ſyſtem, by aſſimilating thereto the new Government, and by combining together the three eſſential forms, which diſtinguiſhed that Conſtitution, under which the people had been uſed to live. Still, however, the political condition of AMERICA muſt be allowed to be precarious, as muſt ever be the caſe under every mutation of

* The term *new Conſtitution* is here retained in conformity to uſage, although the code, which received that denomination, was nothing elſe than an attempt to accommodate the former ſyſtem of domeſtic Polity, to the new ſituation of an independent State.

Govern-

Government; and experience muſt ſhow whether the ſyſtem, which has been there adopted, will be compatible with the Country, when it ſhall have acquired an extenſive population, and have arrived at a ſtate of maturity. It is, indeed, morally certain, that ſo large a portion of Democracy, and, what is conſequent thereon, ſo weak a Government, will never accord with ſuch a change of circumſtances; nay, many intelligent perſons are of opinion, and not without a great appearance of reaſon, that the federal union of theſe States will, with difficulty, ſurvive their preſent CHIEF, even ſhould *he* not outlive, (which is by no means improbable), the influence by which he holds them together.* There is even abundant

* An apprehenſion of the danger which would unavoidably have accompanied the death of Preſident Waſhington, while in office, has, in all probability, induced that Gentleman to reſign his public ſituation, that the devolution of the Preſidency to other hands might be accompliſhed in a tranquil manner, by the aid of that influence, which the General poſſeſſes beyond any other individual. This ſtate of fluctuation and uncertainty is not, however, the only fruit which America has gathered from her revolt. Though flattered by their independence, her citizens do not poſſeſs a tithe of that liberty which they enjoyed in their former ſtate. Among the many proofs of this, ſee the Republican Judge, a work publiſhed under the name of Peter Porcupine, in Philadelphia.—*Note to the Collection.*

ground

ground to conclude, that the juvenile Conſtitution of America is indebted, for its *preſent* exiſtence, to the immenſe Ocean, which ſeparates it from the GALLIC VORTEX. Nothing elſe could preſerve it from the fatal influence of that Revolution, the principles of which were imported into its happy Provinces, through the agency of Mr. Locke's diſciples, and after exciting the American Rebellion, were conſigned to France. There they produced a Revolution, which has convulſed the whole Continent of Europe; and which, by its reverberation acroſs the *Atlantic*, ſhook even America itſelf, during the fraternal embaſſy of Citizen GENET.

THERE is, therefore, nothing to be found in the Annals of Mankind, analogous to the French Revolution. Even the caſes of ROME and AMERICA, which ſeem to bear the neareſt reſemblance to that event, and which are, therefore, chiefly quoted in alluſion thereto, are not of the ſame nature. Never before did the world exhibit an inſtance of a people, altogether ſubſtituting theory for practice, and experiment for experience—tearing up by the roots every inſtitution, political, civil, and religious—breaking down every barrier to factious violence, and popular fury—renouncing all ſubordination—removing every eſtabliſhed gradation of ſociety—ſubvert-

ing the very frame of their ſocial exiſtence—and endeavouring to ſubſtitute an intirely new Conſtitution in the place of that, to which they had been accuſtomed, and under which they had long exiſted as a compact and regularly organized State. Such, however, is the principle of that Revolutionary ſyſtem, which has been carried into effect in France, and which it is the avowed object of the falſe Philoſophy, known by the name of the Rights of Man, to eſtabliſh in every country. How can ſuch a ſyſtem, which is calculated only for the purpoſe of deſtruction, and which is at direct variance with the nature of man and of ſociety, as well as with the uniform experience of mankind—how can ſuch a ſyſtem be expected to afford a baſis for order and regular Government? How can a Conſtitution derived from ſuch a ſource be expected to be permanent, or even practicable?

Of all the idle and abſurd undertakings in which men can engage, the moſt idle and abſurd is that of Conſtitution-making; nor is it poſſible for them to diſplay their vanity, preſumption, and folly, in a greater degree, than by engaging in ſuch an attempt. As well might they pretend to form anew the human race, as to new model the vaſt and complicated machine

chine of Society, and to regulate, according to their own fancy and caprice, its

" ——————— bearings and its ties,
" Its ſtrong connections, nice dependencies,
" Gradations juſt"——.

Unhappily the attempt is as miſchievous as it is abſurd. For it tends to unſettle every thing that has been eſtabliſhed by time and experience—to ſtake the happineſs of millions upon the precarious reſult of fanciful experiment, and of wild and extravagant ſpeculation—to deprive the ſocial bark of its rudder and its compaſs, of its pilot and moſt experienced mariners, and to leave it, thus deſtitute and forlorn, in the midſt of the boiſterous ocean, at the mercy of the winds and waves.

If even the moſt wiſe and virtuous men were to aſſemble, in a tranquil manner, and with the fulleſt poſſible authority, to frame, at once, a Conſtitution for a country, their labours would be fruitleſs, and they would fail to produce any thing capable of being carried into effect. Their Theories might, indeed, attract admiration, as an extraordinary ſpecimen of metaphyſical ingenuity, and they might diſplay an anxious ſolicitude for the happineſs and proſperity of the State; but, with all their apparent

excellence, they would poſſeſs the fatal imperfection—of being *impracticable*. Theſe ſpeculators would find it greatly beyond their ſtrength to put their machine into motion; or if, aided by the impulſe of popular enthuſiaſm, they were to ſucceed ſo far as to procure it a trial, they would ſoon diſcover that its parts were at variance with each other, and that the whole was totally unfit for uſe. The experiment would only ſerve, like every thing purely ſpeculative, to engender diſputes; and it would diſplay the immeaſurable diſtance between theory and practice, and the inſuperable difficulty of ſubſtituting the former in the place of the latter. If the new ſyſtem were even to be received with univerſal and unbounded applauſe—if every individual were eagerly to preſs forward to engage, by the moſt ſolemn oath, to maintain it inviolate, it would not be rendered either more permanent, or more practicable by ſuch a concurrence. The favour of the multitude, having no other foundation than caprice, would ſoon be withdrawn from their Conſtitutional Idol, which would even become the object of their deteſtation the moment it loſt the charms of novelty.

The Conſtitution of a Country is not to be acquired by ſuch means. It cannot be erected upon a ſpeculative baſis It is the ſpontaneous pro-

production of time and circumſtance. It is an effect rather than a cauſe. It is produced *a poſteriori*—never *a-priori*. It is governed by a thouſand influences, over which man has no control. It partakes of the genius—manners—habits—national character—climate—and all the abſolute and relative circumſtances of a Country. It conſiſts, not of abſtract principles or general maxims, but of practical regulations, gradually introduced, under the influence of the above-mentioned cauſes, and it forms an eſſential part of the legal code of a Nation. It is originally founded upon Power, of which it is but a modification, and it cannot be derived from any other ſource. All Government is Power, however variouſly combined. In a courſe of time, and by inſenſible degrees, it acquires the accumulative force derived from habit, education, attachment, confidence, reſpect for antiquity, religious principle, and even from prejudice itſelf; and theſe moral influences, while they conſtitute its principal ſtrength, forming as it were its very ſinews and muſcles, become, themſelves, ſtronger every day. It is thus that Government acquires maturity and ſolidity, and is rendered ſtable and permanent. It is thus that it becomes ſo incorporated with a State, ſo interwoven with every branch and fibre of the body politic, that its deſtruction involves the diſſolution of the ſocial union.

But although theſe ſupervening aids, which time alone can ſupply, are neceſſary to invigorate Government, and to give it a firm eſtabliſhment, it muſt, in the firſt inſtance, derive its origin from phyſical force. Nothing elſe can furniſh the *ſtamina* which are capable of duration, and on which the influences above alluded to can operate. To ſuppoſe that ſpeculation can afford materials, capable of acquiring, by the operation of time, the ſolidity of ſtable and ſettled Government, is no leſs abſurd than to imagine, that a phantom can acquire a corporeal form, and be inveſted with the powers and properties of a material being. Inſtead of being favourable to the fanciful ſyſtems of political theory, time is their great enemy, and their certain deſtroyer. It very ſpeedily expoſes their unſubſtantial nature, and makes them diſappear, like the ſpectres of the night on the approach of day. Thus have vaniſhed the Conſtitutional vagaries of the French Revolutioniſts, even before the rapid flight of time could fairly bring them to the teſt of experience; thus, like the confuſed viſions of a ſick man,—"*velut ægri ſomnia*,"—have they flitted away one after another, without leaving a perfect recollection of any thing but the anguiſh with which they were accompanied?

The ſource of thoſe erroneous and ruinous ſyſtems, which, in modern times, have aſſumed the dignified name of Philoſophy, is a miſtaken idea reſpect-

reſpecting the origin of Government, and, indeed, of ſociety. A ſet of viſionary ſpeculatiſts, in defiance both of reaſon and experience, have imagined that a ſtate of ſociety was preceded by, what they call, a ſtate of nature; in which they ſuppoſe mankind to have been in a condition of perfect liberty, equality, and independence, bound by no laws, connected by no ties, ſubject to no authority, and totally independent each of the reſt;—that, ſenſible of the numerous diſadvantages attending ſuch a ſituation, and deſirous of procuring the benefits of mutual aid, comfort, and defence, they agreed to unite in ſociety—but that, finding it impoſſible to attain the ends of ſociety without Government, and equally ſo for the whole ſociety to exerciſe the functions of Government, they, or a majority of them, appointed perſons, in whom they repoſed moſt confidence, to act as governors, and inveſted them with ſufficient powers for that purpoſe.

Thus, acording to this ſyſtem, Government is a delegation iſſuing from the people, and its power is intirely derived from them. But the people, the only ſource of authority, did not part with their original right. They retained their ſuppoſed Sovereignty; and the power, which iſſued from them in the firſt inſtance, depends, for its continuance, on the ſtreams which flow from the fountain head. In fact, as theſe viſionaries con-

tend, the powers of Government are merely a truſt, created by the People, which they, at all times, are intitled to recal, and to veſt, at their diſcretion, in other hands. They are always free to diſplace the governors whom they have appointed, and to puniſh them for mal-adminiſtration—to diſſolve the Government which they have created, and to chooſe a new one, in whatever form and manner they think proper; over which they will, of courſe, have the ſame control, as they had over the firſt, and ſo on, *ad infinitum*, or, ar leaſt, 'till time ſhall be no more.

THESE crude and unnatural ſpeculations, reſpecting the origin of Government, had long floated in the minds of men, and had been often uſed as a pretext, by factious and turbulent characters, to diſturb the order of ſociety, when they acquired an unfortunate reſpectability and influence, from being ſeriouſly adopted and ſtrenuouſly ſupported by Mr. Locke. That writer moulded them into a ſyſtem, which has ſince been the creed of a party, who, under the denomination of Whigs, conſider themſelves as the only friends to civil liberty. In his Treatiſe on Civil Government, Mr. Locke made the world a preſent, which has proved fatal to its repoſe and happineſs. In the moſt elaborate manner he there contends, that "men are by nature "free, equal, and independent"—that "no one "can

" can be put out of this eſtate, and ſubjected to " the political power of another, or put on the " bonds of civil ſociety, without his own con- " ſent"—that ſuch conſent is " *the only begin-* " *ning of lawful Government*"—that it is falſe to infer, that, " becauſe men are born under Go- " vernment, they are naturally ſubjects to it," or that " they are not at liberty to begin a new " one"—for " no man can, by any compact what- " ever, bind his children or poſterity; a child is " born a ſubject of no country or Government, " but is merely under his father's tuition and " authority, 'till he comes to age of diſcretion, " and then he is a freeman at liberty what Go- " vernment to put himſelf under."

THERE is no doubt that Mr. Locke thought the above ſyſtem of ſociety eſſential to the exiſtence of freedom, and that, under this impreſſion, inſtead of examining, candidly and impartially, whether it was really founded in nature, or conſiſtent with reaſon, he determined, at all hazards, to maintain it; and, like an advocate, wiſhing only to triumph over his adverſary (Sir Robert Filmer), he bent his whole faculties to the ſupport of his hypotheſis. That ſuch a ſyſtem is moſt inimical to the liberties of mankind, will be ſhown hereafter. But to prove that it is impracticable, Mr. Locke is certainly the beſt poſſible evidence. This, with

that inconſiſtency, which is ever the fate of ſyſtem-mongers, he has completely done. For, having aſſerted that individual conſent is "the "only beginning of lawful Government," and contended for the abſolute right of every individual, though born under a Government ſo inſtituted, when he comes of age to refuſe ſubjection to it, he ſoon finds that the ſocial machine cannot be thus kept in motion. He therefore ſeeks for another principle, ſomewhat leſs abſurd, indeed, but equally inapplicable to a ſtate of ſociety; and he gets rid of his difficulty, by veſting, in a majority, the right of binding the other members of his ſelf-created community. But he was not aware that, in eſtabliſhing his fanciful and impracticable right of majorities, he overthrew the very principle of individual conſent, which he had made the foundation of his whole ſyſtem. For he ſays, "If the conſent of the majority ſhall not, "in reaſon, be received, as *the act of the whole*, "and conclude every individual, nothing but the "conſent of every individual can make any thing "to be the act of the whole. But ſuch a con-"ſent is next to impoſſible ever to be had, if we "conſider the infirmities of health, and avoca-"tions of buſineſs, which in a number, *though* "*much leſs than that of a commonwealth*, will "neceſſarily keep many away from the public "aſſembly. To which, if we add the variety of "opinions, and contrariety of intereſt, which un-

"avoid-

" avoidably happen in all collections of men, *the* " *coming into ſociety* upon ſuch terms would be " only like *Cato*'s coming into the theatre, only " to go out again. Such a conſtitution as this " would make the mighty *Leviathan* of a ſhorter " duration than the feebleſt creatures, and not " let it out-laſt the day it was born in; which " cannot be ſuppoſed, till we can think that ra- " tional creatures ſhould deſire and conſtitute " ſocieties only to be diſſolved; for where the " *majority* cannot conclude the reſt, there they " cannot act as one body, and conſequently will " be immediately diſſolved again."

It is ſurpriſing that this writer did not perceive that it would be as impoſſible to obtain individual conſent, for the formation of a ſociety, as for its ſubſequent Government; and that his reference to a majority, to determine for the whole, conſidering the immenſe advantages, which in a ſtate of ſociety, ſome poſſeſs over others, in force, cunning, talents, and influence, was nothing but a paltry ſubterfuge to evade a difficulty, which he found to be inſuperable. To make his ſcheme more plauſible (for it is evident he was ſenſible of treading on ground which could not ſupport him), he endeavoured, indeed, to repreſent the formation of a community as the moſt ſimple thing imaginable. Nothing more than a number of individuals " barely agreeing to unite into one politi-

" cal ſociety," which, he ſays " is all the compact " that is, or needs be, between the individuals " that enter into or make up a commonwealth." This is all the conſequence which, to ſuit his purpoſe, he gives to an act, the moſt important that can be conceived, and involving the greateſt change, which, upon his ſyſtem, can poſſibly occur in the condition of mankind—a change from the ſtate of pure nature, into that of a ſocial community, or commonwealth—a change, of which he admits there is no known precedent. " There " are no inſtances," he allows, " to be found in " ſtory, of a company of men independent and " equal one amongſt another, that met together, " and in this way began and ſet up a Govern- " ment." His fancy, however, wants no aid from hiſtory, but can bring together mankind from a ſtate of nature, that is, from a ſtate much below that of ſavages (for ſavages have always been found in ſociety, however uncultivated), and make them, by the ſolemn and deliberate conſent of each individual, agree to live together in a commonwealth, ſubject to Government and Laws. He can, by the ſole effort of imagination, ſupply the want, which muſt neceſſarily exiſt among *independent* individuals, that of a common language, and make them thoroughly underſtand one another, for the purpoſe of framing ſuch a wonderful connection, which, according to him, has no foundation in nature. He can overcome, at once,

that mutual fear and animoſity, which are natural to mankind, until ſurmounted by habitual intercourſe, and inſpire them at once with confidence and harmony. He can lead theſe untutored brutes (for man out of ſociety cannot be conceived to excel, if he can be ſuppoſed to equal the brute creation), as with a prophetic impulſe, to diſcover, that though they are able to form, by individual conſent, a commonwealth, yet, in ſpite of the ſelf-confidence, which ſo great an effort muſt inſpire, they ſhall not be able to conduct and manage the political machine by the ſame force of general volition; that numberleſs "avocations" and "infirmities," will render it impoſſible for all individuals to attend upon every occaſion; and that a "variety of opinions," and "contrariety of intereſt," which are inſeparable "from all collections of men" *(except in the ſingle great act of conſtituting a commonwealth)*, will prevent their being of one mind. It is not enough, however, for Mr. Locke to make his men of nature foreſee all theſe things—no, their ingenuity equals their ſagacity, and enables them to invent the *doctrine of majorities*, as alone capable of ſurmounting ſo many difficulties in the execution of their ſocial plan. Still, however, the greateſt wonder remains to be noticed. A number of individuals, whoſe will had never been accuſtomed to control, whoſe paſſions had never been ſubject to reſtraint, and who had juſt been

per-

performing an act of the greateſt importance, the formation of a ſociety, to ſecure, to each of them, invaluable advantages, which could not poſſibly exiſt in a ſtate of nature—each of theſe individuals is to poſſeſs ſuch a ſelf-command, as to engage to give up his future will, whenever it ſhall be at variance with that of a majority of his new aſſociates, with whom he never had any previous intercourſe, and from whom he had always fled through fear, unleſs he made them flee from his ſuperior ſtrength. In the moſt refined ſtage of civilization, if the individuals of a nation were to be intirely releaſed from their ſocial connection, by the diſſolution of their Government, there would be no chance of their ſubmitting the diſpoſal of their fate to the calm deciſion of a majority; on the contrary, it is highly probable, nay, abſolutely certain, that a very ſmall proportion would ſpeak and decide for the whole. But it ſeems that, in a ſtate of nature, man is abundantly more tractable than in a ſtate of ſociety; and that civilization has only rendered him more ſelf-willed, obſtinate, and impetuous. Pity that he ſhould ever have made ſo diſadvantageous an exchange!

These glaring abſurdities, attending the ſyſtem of Mr. Locke, ſuperſede the neceſſity of inveſtigating a variety of minor difficulties, with which that ſyſtem is accompanied. It cannot be neceſſary to inquire by what means the aſſembly of indi-

individuals, connecting themſelves, for the firſt time, in ſociety, are to be convoked—by what herald they are to be convened—how theſe ſtrangers to each other, and to every ſpecies of ſocial communication, are to make known and to collect each others ſentiments and wiſhes—how order is to be preſerved in ſo multitudinous an aſſemblage—how the members of this new ſociety are to be regiſtered—by what cement the materials of the new fabric are to be holden together, until Government, inſtitutions, and habits, can be formed—laſtly, as they are all to meet on a footing of perfect equality, how the children are to throw off that "rule and juriſdiction" of their parents, to which Mr. Locke acknowledges them to be ſubject, and which nature has rendered much more ſolid and durable than he ſeems to think—at what age they are to be deemed competent to expreſs their individual conſent—what is to become of the aged, ſick, and infirm, who may be unable to attend the meeting?---Theſe, and a thouſand other queries, might be put to the Philoſopher of wild nature. But the whole hypotheſis is ſo very repugnant to every idea of practicability, that it deſerves only to be conſidered as a romantic viſion, or rather as a fable, ſurpaſſing the moſt incredible legends of antiquity.

It would, however, have been well for mankind, if this ſyſtem had been as *harmleſs* as a fable. But,

But, on the contrary, it has proved a moſt fertile ſource of diſturbance, ſedition, ſlaughter, and anarchy. The levelling doctrine *of a natural equality of rights*, affords a ready pretext to artful and turbulent men to excite the multitude to diſcontent and inſurrection. What can be ſo flattering to the lower orders as ſuch doctrines? What more calculated to make them diſſatisfied with their condition in life, or to ſtimulate them to acts of outrage and cruelty, againſt their ſuperiors in rank or fortune? By ſuch pretexts have ſome of the moſt horrid ſcenes recorded in hiſtory been produced—From ſuch cauſes have proceeded ſome of the moſt deſperate and furious inſurrections which have diſturbed the repoſe, or endangered the exiſtence of Nations*. At laſt aroſe a ſect of Philoſophers, with Mr. Locke at their head, who inculcated theſe principles as a ſyſtem—

* In an excellent pamphlet, intitled, "An Hiſtorical Eſſay on the Principles of Political Aſſociations in a State," by the Rev. John Brand, the moſt remarkable inſurrections which have been produced by the operation of the principle of *natural equality* are enumerated. Theſe are, principally, the inſurrection of the Jews, begun in the reign of Nero and terminated in that of Veſpaſian—the inſurrections of the Bagaudee and Jacquerie in France, and that of Wat Tyler in England; which latter was fomented by ſeditious Orators, one of whom, John Ball, a Prieſt, went about the country teaching the equal right of men to liberty, and all the goods of nature, the tyranny of artificial diſtinction, and the idea of primitive equality.—See alſo Hume's Hiſtory of England, v. 8.

who,

who, without any view to diſturbance, unſettled the minds of men reſpecting their ſocial duties, and their obligations of reſpect, ſubmiſſion, and allegiance, by teaching them that the whole frame of ſociety originated in the individual exerciſe of natural and unalienable rights; that the members of ſociety are, at all times, intitled to diſſolve the bonds, which they had voluntarily formed—to reſume the powers, which they had ſpontaneouſly conferred—and to bring before their High Tribunal the perſons, whom they had inveſted with authority. This ſyſtem, after being long propagated with incredible induſtry, and aſſiſted in its operation, by another ſect of Philoſophers, who laboured, with dreadful ſucceſs, to undermine the two great bulwarks of ſociety, Religion and Morals, at length produced its full effect; and the French Revolution, with its metaphyſical Conſtitutions, and its endleſs train of evils, ſtands confeſſed as the legitimate fruit of the doctrines of the Rights of Man, and of the Sovereignty of the People; and it affords a dreadful exemplification of the truth of Mr. Locke's aſſertion, that "there cannot be done a greater miſchief to Prince and People, than the propagating wrong notions concerning Government."

It is the more ſurpriſing, that men of real talents, and of honeſt intentions, ſhould go out of their way to deviſe ſyſtems, alike miſchievous and

and abſurd, alike repugnant to reaſon and experience, reſpecting the origin of Government, when the plan of Providence on that ſubject is ſo extremely clear and intelligible *.

The all-wiſe Creator of the world has fully provided, and in the beſt poſſible manner, for the government of his creatures. Inſtead of leaving them to diſcover the neceſſity of Government from the want of it, he has taken care that they ſhould never feel that want. He has ſent them into the world in the character of members of ſociety. He has provided for them the protection of parental fondneſs during the defenceleſs and helpleſs ſtages of infancy and childhood. He has prolonged their abſolute dependence on the authors of their being, until habits of ſubjection are firmly rooted, and by inſpiring them with ſentiments of reſpect and gratitude, he has more ſtrongly confirmed thoſe habits. He has rendered the domeſtic connection of a family a complete ſpecimen of a Commonwealth, exhibiting, though upon a ſmall ſcale, power, authority, and ſubordination; and he has thus preſcribed the

* See this ſubject moſt admirably handled in a treatiſe on the Real Origin of Government, by the Rev. John Whitaker, B. D. Rector of Ruan Lanyhorne, Cornwall.—Printed for Stockdale. See alſo the valuable Diſcourſes, preached in America, by the Rev. John Boucher, Rector of Epſom, in Surry, and publiſhed by Robinſon. Diſcourſe 12, on paſſive obedience, non-reſiſtance, and civil liberty.

mode

mode in which they may be beſt governed, by placing them, in the firſt inſtance, under ſuch a form of government, as is moſt calculated to promote their happineſs. By ſending them into the world in ſubjection to paternal authority, he has clearly inſtituted Monarchy, and appointed it to be the Government for man. But froward, proud, and ſelf-willed man, impatient of ſalutary reſtraint, has rebelled againſt the authority of his Prince, and the ordinance of his God; and has thereby produced that miſhapen and unnatural monſter, called a Republic, that he might, under the ſpecious name of liberty, give a greater ſcope to his unruly paſſions. The crime has carried its puniſhment along with it; and Republics, by proving a moſt fertile ſource of miſery, bloodſhed, anarchy, and oppreſſion, have demonſtrated, not only that it is impoſſible to improve on the plans of Providence, but that the daring attempt muſt not hope to eſcape with impunity.

It is plain, however, that the ſtate of equality and independence, from which Mr. Locke calls individuals together, to form themſelves into ſociety, never did nor could exiſt. The courſe of nature pronounces in the moſt clear and deciſive manner againſt ſuch a State. If the human race were produced in a condition of maturity and independence; each individual coming into exiſtence without

out the aid or co-operation of others, and capable of ſubſiſting, without any intercourſe or aſſiſtance whatever; then, indeed, a number of ſuch individuals, meeting together in a plain, for the purpoſe of forming a ſociety, might be ſaid to be in a ſtate of natural equality, and to be perfectly free, whether to enter into ſociety, and to ſubmit to Government or not. But the very reverſe of all this is the caſe. Mankind have always been found in an unequal and dependent ſtate. The real law of their nature, and the very condition of their exiſtence, have placed them in ſuch a ſtate. Mr. Locke, indeed, could not overlook this very material circumſtance, reſulting from the manner, in which the human ſpecies are produced and trained up to maturity. But he endeavours to get rid of the difficulty, which theſe conſiderations oppoſe to his ſyſtem, by diſtinguiſhing between *paternal* and *political* power, and by repreſenting the former as of ſhort duration, as extending only to the purpoſes of education, and as terminating "when the buſineſs of education is over," at which time he maintains that the "bonds of this ſubjection drop quite off," and by leaving "a man at his free diſpoſal," give way to that "full natural equality," the exiſtence of which it is the author's main object to eſtabliſh.

BUT it is plain that Mr. Locke deduces his arguments, upon this ſubject, intirely from the nature and extent of paternal power, as it exiſts in a family, forming only a ſubordinate part of a larger Community, and where the father is, himſelf, ſubject to that *political* power, the whole of which is veſted in the Government of the State. Even in ſuch circumſtances, the connection of parent and children prevents the exiſtence of that "full natural equality" and of that ſtate of "independence," which Mr. Locke ſuppoſes to precede the formation of ſociety. But to do juſtice to the ſubject, we muſt contemplate the condition of a family in thoſe early ages, when it afforded the only tie to keep individuals together. Then, from the neceſſity of the caſe, the power of the father was *political* as well as *paternal*. He was the only law-giver. In him was veſted the ſole authority. The children were brought up in habits of obedience, not merely as children, but as ſubjects. They felt the advantage—the neceſſity—of this ſubjection; and, in their little happy ſtate, there were neither demagogues nor philoſophers, to teach them that ſubordination was ſlavery, and that they were born equal and free. Therefore, they and their children continued under the authority, which they had been accuſtomed to obey, until the family merged in a more exten-

ſive ſocial connection, or until, perhaps, upon the death of its Patriarchal head, it branched out into diſtinct ſocial communities, each under the control of its own *pater familias*.

Mr. Locke, then, is clearly wrong in repreſenting paternal and political power, as being, in all caſes, "perfectly diſtinct and ſeparate—" and "built on different foundations:" and in aſſuming that "parents, *in ſocieties*, where they themſelves are ſubjects, retain their power over their children, and have as much right to their ſubjection as thoſe, who are in a ſtate of nature." But it is obvious that where the family forms the *whole* ſtate, (which is what Mr. Locke *here* calls a ſtate of nature,) it could not be kept together, at leaſt not in due ſubordination, unleſs its chief were King as well as Father; a neceſſity which does not exiſt where the family is only a part of a larger community.

But to deſtroy the *political* ſupremacy of the Father, Mr. Locke reſorts to a ſtrange mode of reaſoning. He ſuppoſes the Mother to have "an equal title" to authority, and he even ventures to appeal to ſcripture, in ſupport of this hypotheſis. The texts of ſcripture quoted by Mr. Locke, on this occaſion, prove no more than what

every one is ready to admit; namely, that children are bound to honour and obey their Mother *as well* as their Father. But this general ſuppoſition is, ſurely, not incompatible with the doctrine of the Father's Sovereignty. There are gradations of honour and obedience, as well as of rank, in every Community.—We are expreſsly commanded to "honour the King, and thoſe who are put in authority under him." We obey the Decree of a Tribunal, as well as an Act of the Legiſlature. But the objection is fully refuted by the very authority, to which Mr. Locke refers in ſupport of it. That authority has, in the moſt explicit terms, put the wife herſelf in ſubjection to the huſband. Indeed, every ſpecies of authority, ancient and modern, proves that there can be no ſuch thing in ſociety, as *a co-ordination of powers*.

It having been thus wiſely and kindly ordained by Providence, that mankind ſhould not be deſtitute of the advantages of Society and Government, even in their moſt early and ſimple ſtate, what can be ſo prepoſterous as to contend, that in their progreſs towards civilization—that in their tranſition from domeſtic to national polity—they muſt diveſt themſelves of thoſe advantages?—that, in order to enlarge their ſphere of mutual dependence, they muſt diſſolve their previouſly ſubſiſting ties, and throw off, at

once, all the relations, which had exiſted from the moment of their birth, and all the habits, which had been continually acquiring ſtrength from that moment, in order to reduce themſelves to a condition of perfect equality and independence: a condition ſo utterly repugnant to their invariable uſage, that it is impoſſible to conceive how the idea of it ſhould enter their minds.

It would be only a waſte of time to refute ſuch egregious abſurdities. If we had no hiſtory, ſacred or profane—no experience or obſervation to guide our opinions on this ſubject, why ſhould we ſuppoſe that nature, in the moſt important of her operations, is not as uniform and conſiſtent, as in her other works? The tender ſapling, by ſlow degrees, is ſpread into the ſtately oak, without being firſt reduced to independent atoms. The child, at length, arrives at manhood, without any intermediate diſſolution, either of his phyſical or moral organization. Why then ſhould we ſuſpect nature to be retrograde in the progreſs of ſociety? Why muſt the Commonwealth of a family, in order to become a great Nation or Empire, be molten down into a number of equal and independent individuals, and break thoſe bonds of ſubordination and dependence, which conſtitute the very *ſtamina* of Nations and Empires. So monſtrous a ſuppoſition would never have been formed if it had not been found neceſ-

ſary to the hypotheſis, which it was determined to eſtabliſh, that Government is founded on conſent.

Even in thoſe caſes, in which an actual and formal delegation of power takes place, there is no ſuch thing as general individual conſent. When different families found it neceſſary to unite, and to form one Community, for the ſake of mutual ſecurity, it was requiſite that a new Power ſhould be created, to preſide over the whole. This power having no previous exiſtence, could only be founded in conſent or choice. But even here, the doctrine of *individual* conſent could have no operation; but the great majority, at leaſt, of every family, would be ſubjected to a new Government, without their being called into the Council, or even aſked for their conſent. Each family having a Government within itſelf, that Government would continue to ſpeak and act for its own ſubjects, as it had been accuſtomed to do, and according to the forms, which had uſually been obſerved. The heads of the reſpective families would, alone, deliberate and decide upon all matters, reſpecting the propoſed aſſociation; and they would confer the new authority, neceſſary to be eſtabliſhed for the government of the whole.

There is, in fact, no eſſential difference between the voluntary combination of ſmall

States, called Families, and that of large States, denominated Nations. In both caſes the act of union muſt be the act of Government. The public opinion, and the general wiſh, would have their due weight, and, perhaps, their influence would be greateſt in the moſt extenſive communities. But individuals, as ſuch, would exerciſe no power. They would be inveſted with no function. They would give no ſuffrage. When England and Scotland were combined into one Kingdom, the queſtion was not decided by a majority of voices. If, indeed, it had been referred to ſuch a mode of determination, it would, probably, have been negatived in Scotland. In like manner, if the projected union, between Great Britain and Ireland, ſhould hereafter take place, it will be accompliſhed through the Governments of the two Nations; and private individuals, in both Countries, inſtead of being convened on the occaſion, will remain at home, unconſulted, unaſked, much to the mortification, no doubt, of the Engliſh Correſponding Society, and of the United Iriſhmen. *

It

* The doctrines, both of individual conſent and of deciſion by the majority of a State, are ſo repugnant to all human experience, that thoſe events in hiſtory, which are moſt in favour with the aſſertors of ſuch doctrines, have been brought about in direct contravention of the will of a major part of the Community, as far as that will could be aſcertained. The event in this country, which is generally, but

It appears, then, that what Mr. Locke calls a State of nature,—that is, a State of abſolute liberty, equality, and independence, in which, as he deſcribes it, "all the power and juriſdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than another," and in which all are "equal, one amongſt another, without ſubordination or ſubjection;"—is a mere phantom of the brain. Mankind were never born in in ſuch a ſtate, nor could any portion of them ſubſiſt in it for a ſingle day. In whatever ſituation we may fancy a number of individuals to be placed, it is impoſſible to diveſt the mind of an idea of ſociety, and of its neceſſary ſupports, authority, and ſubordination. The wildeſt troop of ſavages has its chief, and exhibits a complete inſtance of "power and juriſdiction," of rank and ſubjection. Nay, ſo much at variance is this imaginary ſtate of nature with the real nature of man, that if two children were left in an uninhabited iſland, there cannot be a doubt that they would ſoon contend for the ſuperiority; and thus the main pillar

but very improperly, denominated "the Revolution," and which would be more accurately termed *the abdication*, (an event which Mr. Locke, with his principles, muſt have diſapproved, if he had thoroughly underſtood it) would not have taken place, if the people had been polled upon the queſtion. And the Revolution in France was effected by a groſs and perjured violation, on the part of the National Aſſembly, of the expreſs mandates of an immenſe majority of their Conſtituents. It muſt not, however, be inferred that theſe events, becauſe they are brought together, to illuſtrate a particular point, are ſuppoſed to bear any analogy to each other.

of the doctrine, that Government is originally founded in conſent, falls to the ground.

THAT doctrine, indeed, is in itſelf, utterly repugnant to nature and experience. No Government ever did, or ever could originate in that manner. Power, ſo conferred, would be like a heap of ſand, collected by the wind, which the next gale might ſcatter and diſperſe. The Deity has kindly "fix'd his Canon 'gainſt" ſuch proceedings. Government, inſtead of being the creature or contrivance of man, is, like man himſelf, of divine origin. It is co-eval with his exiſtence. It is a quality inſeparably connected with his nature. It is a condition indiſpenſably annexed to his being. Without even the light of Revelation, the mind would recoil at the ſyſtem of equality and independence, and at the idea of a want of Government until human ingenuity could ſupply the deficiency, as being repugnant to reaſon, experience, and conſciouſneſs. But the ſacred records have left us without excuſe, if we ſuffer ourſelves to be deluded by ſuch idle and ridiculous fancies. Thoſe records trace back the inequality, ſubordination, and dependence of the human race, to its creation.* Thoſe records teach us, that paternal power grew into Patriarchal Government, and thereby became the foun-

* See Whitaker's Real Origin of Government, p. 6, & ſeq.

dation

dation of mighty Empires, which, in profane hiſtory, diſplay, even with nominal preciſion, their connection with the poſt-diluvian fathers of mankind. *

NOR is the opinion of Mr. Locke, reſpecting the manner in which individuals become ſubject to a Government, already eſtabliſhed, leſs repugnant to reaſon and experience, than his theory reſpecting the origin of Government itſelf. Who, without aſtoniſhment, can read ſuch aſſertions as theſe "a child is born a ſubject of no Country or "Government, but is merely under his father's "tuition and authority, till he comes to the age "of diſcretion, and then he is a freeman at "liberty what Government to put himſelf under;" and "nothing can make a man a ſubject or "member of a Commonwealth, but his actually "entering into it by poſitive engagement, and "by expreſs promiſe and compact."

THE foundation of theſe remarkable doctrines, is one of the ſtrangeſt conceits which ever entered into the human mind, that Government has no other title to the allegiance of the Child, than its authority over the father. "Governments (he "obſerves) claim no Power over the ſon, be-"cauſe of that they had over the father

* "Theſe are the families of the ſons of Noah, after their generations in their nations, and by theſe were the nations divided in the earth after the Flood." Gen. c. 10. v. 32.

"no

" nor look upon Children as being their ſubjects, " by their father being ſo." Hence he infers, that " a Child is born a ſubject of no Country or " Gornment," and that he can only become ſo by " poſitive engagement, and by expreſs pro- " miſe and compact." Frail, indeed, would be the ſocial union, if it were not cemented by ſtronger ties than thoſe, by which this writer ſuppoſes Government and ſubjects to be connected. Few have been the individuals, and among the few Mr. Locke himſelf would not, probably, be found, who, by poſſitive engagement, and by expreſs promiſe and compact, have made themſelves members of a Commonwealth. And yet, if Mr. Locke had endeavoured to avail himſelf of his ſuppoſed liberty, to put himſelf under what Government he would, by becoming a ſubject to France, and had afterwards been taken in arms againſt his native Country, he would have learned, to his coſt, that his crude ſpeculations about ſubjection, were at direct variance with the laws, of that Country. He would then have found that he was liable to be executed as a traitor, for having violated thoſe obligations which nature had formed for him, without his privity, which he could by no means in his power diſſolve, and which did not require the ſanction of any expreſs confirmation. He would then have been told, what he ought to have known before, ſince it was told him by one of the greateſt luminaries of the law, Sir Edward Coke.

Coke, that " all ſubjects are equally bounden to their allegiance, as if they had taken the oath, becauſe it is written by the finger of the law in their hearts, and the taking of the corporal oath is but an outward declaration of the ſame *." An ignorance of this was, indeed, the more inexcuſable, becauſe it is the language of univerſal law; and in whatever Country Mr. Locke had been born, the laws of that Country would have led him to the ſcaffold, if he had acted upon his own principles, in the caſe above alluded to. But, without any knowledge of poſitive law, every man's ſpontaneous unſophiſticated feelings inform him, that BY BIRTH he acquired the indelible character, and contracted the indiſſoluble engagements of a ſubject; and, thank Heaven! the conſciouſneſs of this is

* 2 Inſt. 121.

This doctrine is fully recognized by Mr. Juſtice Blackſtone, although that learned Judge ſeems to have been ſomewhat infected by Mr. Locke's hereſy, reſpecting a ſtate of natural liberty.

" Natural Allegiance," ſays that eminent writer, " cannot be forfeited, cancelled, or altered, by any change " of time, place, or circumſtance. For it is a principle " of univerſal law, that the natural born ſubject of one " prince cannot, by any act of his own, no, not by ſwearing " allegiance to another, put off or diſcharge his natural " allegiance to the former."—Bl. 1 Com. 369.

Mr. Juſtice Foſter ſays, " The well-known maxim which " the writers upon our law have adopted and applied to " this caſe, *nemo poteſt exuere patriam*, comprehendeth the " whole doctrine of Natural Allegiance."—Foſt. 184.

at-

attended with the moſt powerful attachment to that maſs of connections, which he calls his Country. The moral ſenſe comes in aid of this conſciouſneſs, and inculcates that the Government, which protected him whilſt in his mother's womb, which took him under its foſtering care, the moment he entered a buſtling world, and defended him againſt perils, which nothing but the ſtrong arm of Government could avert, became intitled to his allegiance and ſubmiſſion through life. Theſe are the dictates of nature, reaſon, and juſtice, written, as Lord Coke ſays, *in our hearts*; and they are calculated to ſtrengthen and to endear thoſe ties, without which, Society, cannot exiſt.

The ſyſtem of Mr. Locke, and the other aſſertors of natural equality, reſpecting the origin of Government, is not more repugnant to nature and hiſtory, than hoſtile to the happineſs of mankind. It is not, indeed, in the power of a ſet of chimerical philoſophers to reverſe the Decrees of Providence, or to ſubvert the ancient foundations of Government. But, taking advantage of the remoteneſs of the period when thoſe foundations were laid, theſe Philoſophers, by propagating their baneful ſpeculations, have materially contributed to diſturb the good order and the peace of ſociety. What can tend ſo much to weaken the ſocial ties, as an idea, that thoſe ties are not of divine, but of human texture?

ture? What can be ſo calculated to leſſen the reſpect of man for Government, as the perſuaſion, that Government derives its origin from individual conſent, and that it is always ſubordinate to that will, to which, as theſe theoriſts contend, it firſt owed its exiſtence *? What, in ſhort, can ſo effectually deſtroy all reverence for Laws, as notions like theſe reſpecting the power, by which the Laws were made? Such ſyſtems, therefore, if they prevail, muſt neceſſarily looſen the bonds, by which men are holden together in a ſocial ſtate; they muſt obliterate all ſenſe of obligation, duty, and allegiance to Government; they unſettle the mind, eradicate its moſt rooted principles, diſſolve its firmeſt attachments to the State, and turn looſe, in the boundleſs wild of ſpeculation and change; they lead, by an immediate operation, to reſtleſsneſs, diſaffection, and turbulence, and, in their ultimate effects, to Sedition, Inſurrection, Civil War, Revolution, and Anarchy. In one word they are the *ſtamina* of that infernal ſyſtem, which combines the moſt profligate characters, the moſt reſtleſs ſpirits, and all perſons who are fond of novelty, or deſirous of innovation, in one Conſpiracy againſt the religious and civil

* It is a common practice with the aſſertors of theſe doctrines, openly to inſult the King, by calling him the *ſervant* of the people; and one of them. (Dr. Price) has had the impiety to inſult, at the ſame time, the King of Kings, by giving, in the Pulpit, the above degrading appellation to his earthly Sovereign.

eſta-

eſtabliſhments of ſociety;— which, when it has, by ſuch means, ſucceeded in overthrowing thoſe eſtabliſhments, erects, under the name of freedom, a deſpotiſm infinitely more cruel and oppreſſive than could poſſibly be maintained, without the aid of that pretext;—and which, like a devouring fire, ſeeks to ſpread itſelf on all ſides, which tends to deſtroy the ſocial order of the whole world, and to eſtabliſh an univerſal empire of confuſion, anarchy, and miſrule. This ſyſtem, which, in a few years, has ravaged one half of Europe, is lineally deſcended from the principles taught by Mr. Locke, reſpecting the Source of Power, and the Natural Liberty and Equality of Man. The Digeſts of that ſyſtem, the Revolutionary Conſtitutions of France, are evidently nothing elſe than exemplifications of thoſe principles; and thus Whiggiſm, as far, at leaſt, as it can be identified with the principles in queſtion, is the parent ſtock of Jacobiniſm.

But are not all theſe evils abundantly compenſated by the production of that choice bleſſing—Liberty? Are not the rights attributed by Mr. Locke and his coadjutors, the Prices and Prieſtleys of modern times, to mankind, both in and out of ſociety, eſſential to the enjoyment of civil freedom? Alas! of all the enemies to ſocial Liberty, none have injured it ſo much as theſe its boaſted advocates. The principles maintained by them are unfavourable to liberty, becauſe they are incompatible with order, with-

without which, by an immutable law of nature, liberty cannot exiſt. They are even productive of the very worſt and moſt debaſing ſpecies of oppreſſion. For, by weakening the reſtraints which are eſſential to the preſervation of ſociety, and by affording pretexts to faſcinate, miſlead, and excite the multitude, they enable the moſt depraved and profligate men (for whom reſtraints are moſt neceſſary, and who are the firſt to take advantage of every licenſe,) to gain a fatal aſcendancy, and, by degrees, to eſtabliſh the moſt galling and mercileſs tyranny, that can poſſibly be exerciſed over a people;—a tyranny, which, while it allows not even the privilege of complaining, inſults its wretched victims with the name of freedom. Frequent inſtances occur in hiſtory, which prove that this is the invariable tendency of Mr. Locke's principles. But the French Revolution affords a ſpecimen of the full operation of thoſe principles. The reſult, who can fully deſcribe? If Mr. Locke were to riſe from his tomb, and behold the fruits which have been produced by *his* tree of liberty, which, after languiſhing for a century in this Country, has, at once, attained a luxuriant maturity, by being tranſplanted into Gallic ſoil, he would, himſelf, lay the axe to the root of that tree.—He would implore forgiveneſs of God and Man, for the miſchief he had unintentionally done—for the very large ſhare he had had in cauſing the inexpreſſible miſeries,

which,

which, for theſe nine years, have afflicted the human race.—He would recognize the hand of God in the Government of Man. He would intreat the world to be no longer miſled by the pernicious doctrines he once taught, but to return to a ſenſe of their indiſpenſable obligation to reſpect and obey lawful authority. But, without diſturbing the aſhes of this dreadfully miſtaken, and inexpreſſibly miſchievous, though well meaning and truly religious Philoſopher, we have a more pathetic monitor than even Locke himſelf, though he ſhould proclaim his own recantation in his winding ſheet, and warn mankind to repent of their diſobedience and rebellions. If we are not convinced by awful experience, "neither ſhould we be perſuaded though one roſe "from the dead."

DIFFERENT, far different from the plan, recommended by the advocates for natural equality, are the means provided by the God of Nature, for the production of Civil Liberty. This valuable privilege of human nature can be founded only on the baſis of ſubjection to regular, ſtable, and firmly eſtabliſhed Government. It cannot flouriſh, indeed, without virtue, morals, and religion; but it cannot exiſt without fixed and permanent authority — without a power, which is paramount to the will and caprices of man. When ſuch power is ſolidly eſtabliſhed, freedom is almoſt a ſpontaneous production, unleſs ſmothered in its progreſs

progreſs by vice and diſſoluteneſs of manners; the certain ſources of deſpotic rule. It is ſo inſeparably connected with ſtability, that its very eſſence conſiſts in the certainty of being governed according to fixed, permanent, and fundamental laws, which, deriving their greateſt force and their beſt ſanction from time, and producing, from lengthened uſage, the attachment of veneration, control and bind even the ſovereign himſelf. So complete is the plan of Providence reſpecting Government, that ſuch laws naturally grow out of the exerciſe of ſettled authority, operating upon ſuch a creature as man, and they will be beneficial in their effects, in proportion as man cultivates orderly and virtuous habits. Even in the ſimpleſt caſe of ſocial ſubordination, that of a family, when it forms part of a State, how naturally does uſage ſupply a ſyſtem of regulation, which could not be overthrown without the greateſt difficulty, and, perhaps, not without diſſolving the little domeſtic ſociety! A maſter, who has long accuſtomed his ſervants to a particular mode of ſubjection, or to certain regular indulgencies, would find the moral force of habit oppoſe inſuperable impediments to the introduction of a new ſyſtem. How much more muſt this be the caſe where the family is, itſelf, the State, acknowledging no other laws than thoſe, by which its own concerns are regulated,

and experiencing, during a long courſe of years, no other change, than that of a conſtant acceſſion of new creatures of habit.

By ſuch means, and not by virtue of an imaginary ſocial compact, which could neither be proved nor enforced, is the governing Power ſubjected to certain fixed and fundamental principles, and to a particular mode of exerciſing its authority, inſtead of being left to govern abſolutely, and by its own will. This is the proper deſcription of Civil Liberty, which will be more perfect, in proportion as the principles of a Conſtitution are definite, and certain in their operation; provided they do not tend to relax the energy of Government. But as theſe principles ariſe originally from uſage, and derive their greateſt force from habit, it would be vain to ſeek for their formal eſtabliſhment. They form the unwritten, common law of Society, and are not to be traced to any written code, or to the ſolemn and deliberate act of any man, or body of men. If they aroſe in ſuch a manner, they would want that efficacy, that ſuitableneſs, that durability, which they derive from being the ſpontaneous and gradual production of nature. Like the ſource of a great river, their origin may elude all reſearch, while they flow in an uninterrupted and irreſiſtible courſe down the ſtream of time.

It is in this manner that Conſtitutions are formed and ſettled. Not, according to that modern ſyſtem, which, tending invariably to invert the natural order of things, ſuppoſes, not only that a Conſtitution may be formed at once, but that it ſhould conſtitute the baſis of Government,—but, gradually and inſenſibly, by cuſtom and habit, co-operating with numberleſs cauſes, both phyſical and moral, which reciprocally ariſe out of, and govern, the peculiar circumſtances of a Country. In vain do the arrogant and impious tribe of Conſtitution-mongers attempt to rival the works of nature. They may, indeed, chiſel out the lifeleſs form of a Conſtitution according to their fancy and caprice. But where ſhall they ſteal the Promethean fire, to animate their torpid maſs, or enable it to perform one function of ſocial life?

A Conſtitution is an acceſſory or modification of a Government, which, of courſe, muſt have a previous exiſtence, otherwiſe there will be no ſubject matter, on which a Conſtitution can attach *. Government is the parent ſtock or trunk, from

* In a remarkably ſound and uſeful work, intitled, "Thoughts on the Engliſh Government," of which Mr. Reeves was, at leaſt, the Editor, the term *Conſtitution* is aptly repreſented as a laconic expreſſion, ſignifying "the Conſtitution of the Government." The extraordinary merit

from which, in a regular courſe of political vegetation, ſhoot forth the Conſtitutional branches, producing the goodly fruits of ſalutary freedom and ſocial ſecurity. Unleſs, indeed, there exiſt a fixed Power, in the poſſeſſion of the Sovereignty, and capable of enforcing ſubmiſſion, a people muſt be deſtitute of that ſocial tie, which is eſſential to political union. They would, in that caſe, form only a maſs of atoms, without order or coherence. Their condition would be anarchical, and could no more afford a foundation for any ſolid and permanent ſyſtem, than moving ſands, or flowing waves. But when a ſtable Government is firmly eſtabliſhed, then it is that time and circumſtance have their due operation. It is then that the courſe of events, co-operating with the influence of pre-exiſting cauſes, gradually produces and completes that political organization, uſually termed a Conſtitu-

of this work could not fail, any more than the other great ſervices which its reputed author had rendered his Country, to call forth the reſentment of that Jacobinical faction, which are inceſſantly inſulting and libelling his Majeſty's Title, and, indeed, all lawful Government, by drinking, either the ridiculous toaſt, *the Majeſty of the People*, or the treaſonable one, *the Sovereignty of the People*. The writer of this has had an opportunity of ſeeing the truly Conſtitutional Doctrines of the above Publication further explained, and elucidated by authorities, in another Pamphlet, which, as yet, is only in private hands, but which, in his opinion, ought to be publiſhed for the peruſal of every one.

tion. It is then, and then alone, that a people can acquire that due weight, which is calculated to ſecure their juſt and ſalutary rights, and which may even enable them, as occaſion offers, to obtain firm and ſolid barriers againſt oppreſſion.

They muſt, however, even in this progreſſive ſtate of improvement, ſteer clear of abſtract ſpeculation. At no period of a people's hiſtory can ſuch ſpeculation have any other effect, than to check their progreſs towards the perfection of which they are capable, to produce the ſacrifice of what they have already gained, and to poiſon their felicity. Experience is the parent of practical wiſdom; and it is only when, under *her* guidance, remedies are applied, in a legal and circumſpect manner, for the correction of great and undoubted evils, that innovation can be productive of any ſolid and durable advantage. *Thus*, indeed, even abuſes may lead to improvement, and oppreſſion itſelf, may ultimately be productive of ſecurity. But ſpeculative innovation tends only to ſubverſion; and it is the moſt fatal enemy of all political inſtitutions, and of all ſocial happineſs.

If, therefore, according to the unchangeable laws of nature (thus uniform and analagous in their

operation, whether they regard the phyſical, or the ſocial exiſtence of man), it be impoſſible for theory to form the baſis of any practicable ſyſtem of Government, how vain and preſumptuous, and, unfortunately, at the ſame time, how miſchievous muſt be the attempt, to ſubſtitute a new and experimental ſyſtem, in the place of one which has been long eſtabliſhed,—which time and experience have confirmed,—and under which, (whatever defects, like every thing human, it may poſſeſs,) a State has become flouriſhing and proſperous. How can ſtability attend a new Conſtitution, which, beſides being defective in its foundation, and viſionary in its nature, has to encounter the reſiſtance ariſing out of the previous ſtate of things, and to ſtruggle with all thoſe influences, which have been flowing uninterruptedly, and with conſtantly increaſing force, from the remote ſources of antiquity. Although it may be poſſible, by the diffuſion of the poiſonous and diſorganizing principles of the modern Philoſophy, to corrupt and inflame a people to ſuch a degree, as to effect, by their means, the ſubverſion of an ancient Government,—by depriving it, for a time, of the eſſential ſupport of opinion, and by reducing it to its mere phyſical force,—ſtill, however, in real ſtrength and influence, vanquiſhed as it may ſeem, it will be vaſtly ſuperiour to any ſyſtem that can be ſubſtituted in its place. Thoſe moral influences, which were formed gradually, during a long ſucceſſion,

ceſſion of ages, however they may appear to yield to the momentary impulſe of miſguided enthuſiaſm, can only be deſtroyed by the operation of time, producing counter-influences of a ſimilar nature. But the formation of ſuch counter-influences is almoſt inſuperably difficult, becauſe reſiſted by the invincible tendency of human nature, collectively as well as individually, to return to long eſtabliſhed habits. Mean while, opinion, diverted, by artificial cauſes, from its accuſtomed channel, finds it impoſſible to fix and ſettle any where elſe; like Noah's Dove, it meets with no reſting-place; and, having no direction, but what it receives from caprice, it is inceſſantly fluctuating, until the miſeries, attending ſuch a ſituation, produce the conviction, that the former ſtate of quiet and repoſe was infinitely preferable to all that can be gained by a change: and then, like a tree, for a time forcibly inclined towards the ground, but at length releaſed from the violent preſſure, opinion will ſpring with irreſiſtible force, and, perhaps, with an inſtantaneous impulſe, into its ancient and wonted direction. There is danger, indeed, that the ſtate of anarchy, produced by the removal of the former Government, may afford an opportunity for the eſtabliſhment of ſome violent deſpotiſm, ſome ferocious ſyſtem of tyranny, that may, by the influence of terror, maintain itſelf, until ancient impreſſions be almoſt effaced, and the recollection of former happineſs be nearly extinct;

until the ſteady adherents of the former ſyſtem be cut off, by the axe of the executioner, or by a natural death; and until a new generation ſhall have ariſen, trained up in habits of fear and ſervile ſubmiſſion, and the country be made to experience no leſs a change, than if a foreign conqueror, at the head of overpowering armies, had tranſplanted into it the laws, manners, and inhabitants of another clime. *Then*, indeed, may the former Government be intirely exterminated, and deprived of all chance of reſtoration: but never can this be done by ſpeculation and theory, which, whatever metaphyſical Politicians may imagine, are incapable of ſubſtituting any durable eſtabliſhment.

The ancient Monarchy of France is, for theſe reaſons, after an apparent deſtruction of ſix years, more formidable to its enemies than it was at the moment of its ſubverſion; and, degraded as it ſeems, it is becoming more and more formidable every day. The energy of its rights, and the force of its claims, have ſurvived every ſyſtem, attempted to be ſubſtituted in its place, and it poſſeſſes more real ſtrength than any of the factions, which has been able to uſurp the Powers of Government. Thoſe factions, notwithſtanding their extreme mutual animoſity, are obliged to combine, in order to prevent its ſpeedy Reſtoration: for they know that it would, in an inſtant,

ſtant, cruſh them all to atoms, and for ever blaſt their ambitious hopes: and by their ſevere decrees and annual oaths againſt Royalty, they bear an unequivocal teſtimony to the force of ancient rights, and to the ſtrength of the Royal cauſe.

SCARCELY inferior in abſurdity to the ſyſtem of inventing New Conſtitutions, is that of adopting, or imitating, in one country, the Government and Conſtitution of another. The ſcheme of tranſplanting Conſtitutions is one of the wildeſt flights of human folly, and muſt, wherever it is attempted to be carried into effect, be productive of the utmoſt confuſion and miſchief. Conſtitutions can thrive only in the ſoil where they firſt ſtrike their roots: they can never be adapted to a ſtate, unleſs they

"Grow with its growth, and ſtrengthen with its ſtrength."

And, however excellent they may be in the country to which they belong, they would be totally uſeleſs, becauſe unſuitable, every where elſe. Were the Turkiſh Divan to be modelled like the Engliſh Legiſlature, and the Grand Signior to ſhape his authority, in imitation of that of the Britiſh Monarch, the inhabitants of Turkey, inſtead of having reaſon to rejoice at the change, would ſpeedily find it productive of all the evils of Anarchy. It is as illiberal as it is erro-

erroneous, to judge of the felicity of others by what produces our own. The only ſafe teſt of political, as well as of perſonal, happineſs, is content—and curſed be the man who would deprive either States or individuals of this invaluable bleſſing.

The reader will recollect, that the above reaſoning, tending to ſhew the abſurdity of Conſtitution-making, proceeded upon the ſuppoſition, that none but the moſt wiſe and virtuous men ſhould be employed in that hopeleſs work. But who can be ſo ignorant of human nature, as to ſuppoſe, that this taſk can ever devolve on *wiſe* and *virtuous* men. When once the Government of a Country is ſubverted, there muſt either exiſt a force, adequate to compel ſubmiſſion, and to preſerve order, (and ſuch a force muſt be abſolutely deſpotic, to ſupply the want of the numerous moral aids, by which the authority of the former Government was ſupported),—or the bands of ſociety are diſſolved, and the dreadful reign of Anarchy inſtantly commences. The voice of wiſdom and virtue is then no longer heard. In the confuſion and uproar that muſt inevitably enſue, all political conſequence is ſure to be engroſſed by men of the worſt principles, of the vileſt characters, and of the moſt profligate lives,—intermingled with mad and furious enthuſiaſts, indifferent what calamities they bring on

on their Country, provided they can procure an experiment of their viſionary projects. Such are the men who will be either conſpicuous on the Stage, or ſecretly intriguing behind the Curtain: and who, divided and ſubdivided into numberleſs factions, each ſtruggling for the aſcendancy, will affect to aſſume the important taſk of reducing the chaos into order, by framing a ſyſtem, which every one will endeavour to adapt to his own particular purpoſes. But the honeſt and ſober citizen, who really wiſhes for the welfare of his Country, and who is incapable of reſorting to baſe and diſhonourable means, muſt either decline all competition with ſuch men, or expoſe himſelf to certain deſtruction. To the incoherent maſs, thus jumbled together, will be given the name of a Conſtitution. But what kind of Conſtitution will it be, framed and modelled by ſuch men, and under ſuch circumſtances? Artfully diſguiſed under the moſt ſpecious profeſſions and the moſt faſcinating promiſes, it may, indeed, gain the confidence, and even the applauſe of weak minds, but it will ſerve only to prolong the public miſery, and to accelerate the public ruin. It will be, alternately, a ſource of anarchy, and an engine of tyranny; and it will be uſed by its makers, according to its original deſign, as the ladder of their ambition, which they will either kick down, when they ſhall have no further uſe for it, or convert into a ſuitable form of deſpotiſm, under

which they may inſult an oppreſſed and enſlaved people, with the ſounds of liberty, virtue, and patriotiſm.

Such have been the effects of every Conſtitution hitherto produced during the Revolution of France—ſuch will be the effects of every Conſtitution that ſhall be brought forward in that Country, until, upon the return of the lawful Government, the people ſhall ceaſe to be the ſport of ſuch abſurd and miſchievous ſpeculations. That people, after all they have loſt, and all they have ſuffered, are, in appearance, much farther from the attainment of order, tranquillity, and ſettled Government, than when they firſt effected the overthrow of their Monarchy. They are conſtantly vibrating between the extremes of anarchy and tyranny, each of which preponderates in its turn: and, during the dreadful contention, they ſuffer the accumulated horrors of unbounded licentiouſneſs, and the moſt grievous oppreſſion. Poſſeſſing no liberty, but what conſiſts in anarchy and licentiouſneſs, they are flattered with an ideal Sovereignty; but it is a Sovereignty which, like that of the latter Kings of their firſt Race, is an empty ſound, and conſiſts only in their being brought occaſionally forward, in idle and inſulting pageantry, by their Mayors of the Palace, who *really* exerciſe the ſupreme dominion. Conſtitution ſuc-

ceeds

ceeds to Conſtitution only to prevent a termination of their miſeries, by giving a new *momentum* to the Revolution. Thus have they gone on ſince they threw off their allegiance to their lawful Sovereign, whom it was their honour and their happineſs to obey—thus will they go on until they ſhall return to *that* allegiance—unleſs, indeed, before they regain their ſenſes, another Robeſpierre, more fortunate than the firſt, ſhould ſucceed in eſtabliſhing a ferocious and bloody tyranny, and allow them only to regret, in ſilent and hopeleſs anguiſh, the mild, beneficent, and paternal GOVERNMENT of the BOURBONS.

THE

9 DE 63

THE

# DANGERS

OF

# *PREMATURE PEACE.*

PUBLISHED AT THE CLOSE OF THE YEAR

1795.

BRITISH MUSEUM

THE

# DANGERS OF PREMATURE PEACE.

THE apparent influence of the French Revolution on the human mind, is neither the leaſt ſurprizing, nor the leaſt alarming of its effects. That Revolution ſeems to have a tendency, not merely to diſturb the ſocial relations, to ſubvert all order and government, and to overthrow every ancient ſyſtem and inſtitution, but alſo to confound the underſtandings of mankind, to reverſe every ſettled principle, to break every eſtabliſhed chain of reaſoning, to diſſolve all accuſtomed aſſociations of ideas, and to involve individuals in a mental, while it reduces the world to a political anarchy. Not only do things aſſume a new value, but they are eſtimated according to an inverted ratio. Virtue and vice—right and duty—authority and obedience, ſeem to have exchanged places. In France, the Revolution has inverted the ſocial edifice, by levelling to the ground the lofty point, ſo neceſſary to the exerciſe of a general ſuperintend-

ence—ſo eſſential to the beauty and harmony of the ſtructure—and by elevating the broad and cumb'rous baſis into the air. It is not ſurprizing that the reſult of ſo wild an experiment, ſhould have been the converſion of the once noble fabrick into a maſs of ruins, and that every attempt to re-erect the building, upon the ſame unnatural principle of inverſion, ſhould have totally failed. But it is truly aſtoniſhing that a diſpoſition to imitate the fatal example ſhould any where prevail—it is truly aſtoniſhing that the neighbouring States, which received a moſt violent concuſſion from the fall of the ancient Edifice, inſtead of uniting to raiſe it again upon its original baſe, and in its former proportions, ſhould ſeem almoſt inclined to leave the horrid gap, although daily increaſing by the downfal of ſome *proximate* eſtabliſhment, and viſibly tending to undermine even the moſt *remote*.

Such however is the folly contained in the propoſal of treating for peace, with the Anarchical *Republic* of France. It is impoſſible to liſten to ſuch a propoſal, without loſing ſight of the dictates, both of recent experience and of ancient wiſdom, without renouncing every maxim of policy known to former times, and without abandoning whatever has been hitherto eſteemed

of

of ineſtimable value, and of indiſpenſable importance. To negociate with France in her preſent ſituation would be to relinquiſh at once that Balance of Power, which our anceſtors conſidered as eſſential to the ſecurity of Europe, and which it has been the object of ſo many wars, and the work of ſo many ages, to ſettle and preſerve. If it be poſſible to divert the mind from the ſublime ſpeculations of modern philoſophy, it may not be uſeleſs to conſider the ſubject in this light.

THAT principle of ambition, which has been planted in the human mind for the wiſeſt and kindeſt purpoſes, as a ſpring of action—as a ſtimulus to exertion—as the means of unfolding the faculties of the ſoul, and of preſerving it from languor and apathy, tends, like all our valuable propenſities, to an extreme, injurious both to ourſelves and others, unleſs regulated and controled by adequate reſtraints. The ſame exceſs, to which individuals are expoſed, and which can only be checked by the operation of ſalutary laws, is, in a ſtill greater degree, to be apprehended among thoſe combinations of individuals, which conſtitute ſocieties or ſtates; and *that*, in proportion to the extent, power, and reſources of ſuch combinations. The cauſes of public and private con-

tention, of litigation and of war, are thus interwoven in the conſtitution of man, and inſeparable from his nature; and while we muſt laugh at the abſurdity of thoſe, who indulge in the vain and prepoſterous ſpeculation, that it is poſſible for wars intirely to ceaſe, while the world is peopled with *men*, we muſt be reconciled to the ſyſtem eſtabliſhed by Providence, if we view it in the aggregate, and reflect that the evil which, conſidered abſtractedly, humanity cannot but bewail, is a neceſſary conſequence of the active principle, which impels man to all his exertions, which inſpires him with energy, and which is the ſource both of his utility and happineſs.

The cauſe which tends, ſo unavoidably, to the production of wars, will, of courſe, operate with more effect among nations, in proportion as their contiguity, connection, and intercourſe, furniſh grounds of general rivalry and jealouſy, or of particular differences and diſputes. Even the advancement of civilization and its attendant diſcoveries, which are reciprocally the cauſe and effect of a more intimate connection between States, will neceſſarily open new ſources of hoſtility, and increaſe thoſe which already exiſt. Particularly, wherever a number of neighbouring States are placed in a ſituation of habitual intercourſe and mutual dependence, there the cauſes of hoſtility may be expected to be moſt

moſt frequent. In ſuch a caſe it is evident that a new danger ariſes; namely, that ſome State, by the acquiſition of an undue preponderance, ſhould enable itſelf to attain a dominion over the reſt, and thereby to deſtroy their liberties and independence. To prevent ſuch a misfortune, it is neceſſary to eſtabliſh and preſerve what is called, a Balance of Power, the object of which is to ſecure a general equilibrium, ſo that it may be impoſſible for any one State to acquire too great an aſcendancy. For this purpoſe leagues and combinations are formed, as circumſtances render them neceſſary, to maintain the balance. And often, without any other ground of hoſtility, neutral nations, upon this principle of ſelf-preſervation and general ſecurity, are authoriſed and impelled to interfere in quarrels, in which they had no original concern: and to throw themſelves into the lighter ſcale, to ſave it from being intirely overpoiſed, or to dictate, as umpire, ſuch terms as they may think neceſſary to preſerve a due equilibrium.

WITHOUT entering into the queſtion, how far the ancients were ſenſible of the neceſſity of ſuch a balance of power—without referring to the Peloponneſian war—to many other wars carried on among the Republics of Greece—to the confederacy produced by a jealouſy of the Macedonian Power, and to various oth proofs furniſhed

niſhed by hiſtory, that the principle is not of modern invention;—without endeavouring to account for that ſurpriſing and general inattention to this principle, which enabled the Romans to extend their empire, and to enſlave the world; (an inattention to which, as Mr. Hume ſays*, Hiero, King of Syracuſe, formed the only exception, furniſhing thereby to Polybius an occaſion to prove, that a very accurate idea of the nature and objects of a balance of power was poſſeſſed by that hiſtorian †);—without carrying our reſearches ſo far back, the hiſtory of modern Europe, and the very complex ſyſtem which combines this quarter of the globe, in the moſt intimate connection of mutual dependence, demonſtrate, in the cleareſt manner, that the preſervation of a due balance of power, is of indiſpenſable neceſſity, both for the ſecurity of the general and common rights of all the States ſo connected, and of the individual independence

* See Hume's Eſſays, Vol. I. p. 357.

† Polybius repreſents Hiero as convinced that the preſervation of Carthage, was neceſſary for that of his own Dominions, "leſt, by its fall, the remaining power ſhould be able, with-"out conteſt, or oppoſition, to execute every purpoſe and "undertaking;" and here, (ſays the hiſtorian) "he acted "with great wiſdom and prudence. For it is never, on any "account, to be permitted, *that ſuch a force ſhould be thrown "into one hand, as to incapacitate the neighbouring States from de-"fending their rights againſt it.*" Lib. I. c. 83.

and

and proſperity of each. Common prudence preſcribes a conſtant and never ceaſing attention to this object, the importance of which renders it a juſt cauſe for war, and conſtitutes a war, ſo undertaken and purſued, a war of defence. This, therefore, may be conſidered as the vital principle of European polity, and the ſoul of union, harmony, and order, among the States of which Europe is compoſed. It is the grand deſign and ſcope of the laws of nations, and the principal aim of thoſe treaties, by which the reſpective rights and intereſts of European States have been regulated and ſecured.

A very little attention to the nature of the different forms of government known to mankind, and to the effects, internal and external, which thoſe forms have a tendency to produce, will convince any one that France cannot be a Republic, conſiſtently with this balance of power. It is ſuggeſted by reaſon, and that ſuggeſtion is confirmed by hiſtory and experience, that nations where the Republican ſyſtem prevails, muſt be abundantly the moſt prone to war. They are peculiarly ſubject to agitation and diſquiet, and expoſed in a remarkable degree to thoſe influences, which tend, inceſſantly, to produce domeſtic broils and foreign diſputes. They contain no principle which can reſtrain the workings of ambition, or the machinations of intrigue: no ſuperintending con-

trol to limit, as in a Monarchy, the aſpiring views of individuals, or the daring projects of party; and to ſay to each reſtleſs ſpirit, "thus far mayeſt thou go, but no farther." They preſent, on the contrary, a boundleſs horizon to the ambitious, and give a free ſcope to the moſt violent ſtruggles for aſcendancy.

The diſadvantages attending a Republic, operate, in a greater degree, *in proportion to the prevalence of the democratical principle*; and where that principle is predominant, the State is, unavoidably, in conſtant fermentation, and the paſſions of the people, which are then the only engine of power, are perpetually excited by the machinations of faction, the operations of cabal, and the artifices of popularity. The effects, too, produced on the diſpoſition and manners of a people by Republican principles and habits, are alſo unfavourable to tranquillity, foreign and domeſtic. The character of Republicaniſm, from the Roman Brutus, down to the Britiſh Cromwell, and from him to the more modern Robeſpierre of France, has ever been conſpicuouſly diſtinguiſhed as ſtern, moroſe, and haughty,—ungrateful, turbulent, and impatient of control or contradiction—inſidious, hypocritical, irritable, and intolerant—greedy of power—tyrannical under the maſk of liberty—implacable, vindictive, and ſanguinary.

THE above diſpoſitions, which are the natural growth of that ſtate of mind, which acknowledges no ſuperior, are, of courſe, congenial to a Republican, and they are even found to characterize, in a greater or leſs degree, thoſe perſons, who, under monarchical eſtabliſhments, diſplay a bias for Republican principles. The cauſes, which produce ſuch internal effects, are not at all likely to render a nation mild, moderate, juſt, or pacific, in its external relations. On the contrary, a Republic is ever ready to engage in war, on the ſlighteſt and moſt futile pretences, upon the mere impulſe of pride or paſſion, and without allowing any time for deliberation. The ſmalleſt affront —the moſt trivial iujury—nay, an imaginary inſult—will ſuffice, to call forth democratic vengeance. Inſtantly is the popular fury kindled into a blaze, and nothing is able to reſtrain its violence. Blind and inconſiderate rage is taken for patriotiſm, and vain, nay, perhaps, dangerous, would be the attempt to moderate its impulſe. It is even one of the main reſources of faction to flatter the national arrogance, under an affected ſenſibility for the national honour; to promote, on all occaſions, an eagerneſs to appeal to the ſword; and to plunge the State in the horrors of War, by repreſenting its arms as invincible. Nay, a ſtate of foreign War is often neceſſary, to preſerve a Republic from being torn to pieces by domeſtic convulſions. Nor is this all. Republics are not more prone to engage in War, than furious, deſperate, and

cruel, in its proſecution. To attain the object, be it what it may, that rouſes the paſſions—to gratify reſentment, or to bring ruin on an enemy, they are ever ready to riſk their own deſtruction. Theſe qualities of a Republican government, which render it ſo unfavourable to the harmony and repoſe of mankind, and ſo incompatible with ſocial order and good neighbourhood, acquire additional force and malignity, in proportion to the extent and population of the country, which has the misfortune to be ſubject to ſuch authority. It has, indeed, been a principle generally received, that only very ſmall States are ſuſceptible of that form of government*.

Such being the character and effects of the Republican Syſtem, it is obvious, that the ſubſtitution of that Syſtem, in any Country, in the place of a Monarchical Government, muſt neceſſarily produce the utmoſt confuſion at home, and be attended with a violent and dangerous convul-

* The Roman Empire is ſometimes cited by the favourers of Republics, as an exception to this rule. But thoſe perſons ſeem to forget that they include in the Roman Empire thoſe immenſe acquiſitions, which a ſmall Republic gained, by its unbounded ambition, and which it held in ſubjection, in the nature of colonies, dependent upon the Republic, but not forming a part of it, nor admitted to the privilege of citizenſhip.

ſion

ſion abroad, to the full extent of its foreign influence. But of all the nations on earth, this remark it moſt applicable to France, which is, by far, the leaſt fitted for ſuch a change. The ardent and impetuous diſpoſition of the French people, and, it may be added, the national levity of their character, render the *firm* and *vigorous* control of Monarchical authority neceſſary, both for their own happineſs, and the ſafety of their neighbours. The very qualities which, under *ſuch* a Syſtem, tend to quicken their ſenſe of honour, to give a dignity to their obedience, and even to furniſh a ſecurity againſt oppreſſion, render them, when left to themſelves, furious, ferocious, and ſanguinary. Releaſed from that beneficent control, which can only be enforced by the concentration of power in the hand of a Sovereign, ſuch a people muſt, in the nature of things, ruſh

"——— lawleſs through the void,
"Deſtroying others, by themſelves deſtroy'd."

The health of ſuch a nation conſiſts in the firm and immoveable eſtabliſhment of regal authority—its poiſon in the exerciſe of popular ſway. And no rational friend to the happineſs, or even to the liberties of France, can ever wiſh to ſee its intereſts in the power of democratical aſſemblies.

But what ſhall be ſaid of that ſyſtem of things, which France has thought proper to denominate a Republic—a ſyſtem of organized anarchy and unbounded licentiouſneſs—containing no one principle of regular government—acknowledging no ſovereignty, but that of the people, which it profeſſes to recognize in the fulleſt extent of the prepoſterous, diſorderly, and anti-ſocial term—renouncing all the ties of ſociety, diſowning all the obligations of Religion and Morality, and, (far from ſtopping at the ſubverſion of the Monarchy,) aboliſhing all the ancient inſtitutions, which might have had ſome effect in reſtraining the exceſſes of a people, though releaſed from the control of legitimate authority.

Abandoned to ſo wild and infuriate a ſyſtem, France has carried the principles of internal violence, ferocity, and cruelty, and of external injuſtice, aggreſſion, and hoſtility, to a pitch never before known; and ſhe has diſclaimed all pacts and engagements, previouſly ſubſiſting with other States, and all obligations of faith and honour with other governments, which ſhe choſe to call tyrannical. Availing herſelf of her immenſe reſources, of her unrivalled advantages, both for attack and defence—collecting all her force, with a rage and deſperation which no regular government could employ, and deriving additional ſtrength from her maniacal fury—ſeconding, by her formidable arms, her ſtill more formidable and deſtructive principles, and em-

ploying

ploying her infernal arts in exciting the people of every country to inſurrection, and in ſpreading that contagion which every State is ſo diſpoſed to imbibe—by ſuch means has this monſtrous and miſhapen Republic *, baffled all the efforts and all the calculations of military ſkill, and, notwithſtanding the moſt powerful confederacy ever known, and which nothing but ſo extraordinary and unprecedented a danger could have produced, brought Europe to a criſis never before experienced, and never before apprehended †.

WHERE now is that balance of power, to which our anceſtors attached ſuch importance? How can that balance co-exiſt with a force ſo wild and irregular, ſubject to no rule or principle, and not more formidable in its ſtrength and reſources, than vicious in its nature, and malignant in its diſpoſition—Can ſuch a force coaleſce with the

* "*Monſtrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.*"

† "What did the enlightened Republicans wiſh for, (ſays Briſſot in his letter to his Conſtituents,) before the 10th of Auguſt, men who wiſhed for liberty, not only for their own country, but *for all Europe?* They believed that they could generally eſtabliſh it *by exciting the governed againſt the governors, in letting the people ſee the facility and advantages of ſuch inſurrections.*"

ſyſtem

ſyſtem of Europe, or with any ſyſtem of civilized ſociety? Can it be expected to maintain relations of amity and concord with any regular government? Or is not its exiſtence eſſentially incompatible with order, harmony, and repoſe, and with the ſafety of every State?

If the ancient French Monarchy had ſeized upon the territories acquired, *in ſuch a manner*, by the Republic, would not the reſt of Europe have ſhuddered at ſuch approaches towards univerſal dominion, and, inſtead of diſgracing itſelf by talking of Peace, have combined to humble a State, before ſo mighty, and to put it out of its power to realize its ſchemes of aggrandizement. A much greater danger now preſents itſelf. Europe has now to fear, not the univerſal ſovereignty of the Houſe of Bourbon, but an evil of infinitely greater magnitude, and infinitely more eaſy in its production—the univerſal extenſion of French anarchy. Let any one look upon the map of Eurpoe, and trace the progreſs of the Republican arms in two campaigns;—let him ſee the countries over-run by the Republic, and now in her poſſeſſion;—let him mark the inſidious, encroaching, and inſatiable nature of French democratical ambition; which, notwithſtanding the moſt ſolemn renunciation of all views of conqueſt, has added conqueſt after conqueſt to its territories, has diſcovered the Rhine to be the natural boun-

boundary of the Republic *, and could, doubtleſs, with equal facility, make the like diſcovery as to the Elbe or the Oder, or even demonſtrate that nature had preſcribed no bounds to the empire of theſe friends and patrons of the human race :—let him alſo ſurvey the ſtill more ſtupendous moral effects of the French Revolution ;—let him review the operation of its principles, and conſider their infectious nature, their rapid ſpread, their deleterious effects, every where viſible, in that ſpirit of inſubordination, which has already diſplayed itſelf ſo openly, and which is hourly gaining ground :—let him, after having conſidered theſe things, lay his hand on his heart ; and declare, as an honeſt man, not merely whether the exiſtence of France as a Republic, and particularly as ſuch a Republic, be

* On numberleſs occaſions this modeſt pretenſion of extending the Republic to the Rhine has been aſſerted ; but Cambaceres in a report from the Committee of Public Safety, March 3, 1795, ſtated the Alps, the Pyrenees, and the two Seas to be the natural boundary of the French Republic. This ſtatement allows a conſiderable latitude for future acquiſitions, as, inſtead of ſtopping at the Rhine, it does not intimate how far northward the boundary is meant to be puſhed.

Briſſot, leſs modeſt ſtill, formed the idea of an univerſal empire of liberty to be founded by France " Liberty," he ſays in his letter to his Conſtituents, " might eaſily have found no other boundaries than thoſe of the world."

com-

compatable with the balance of power—but whether it be poſſible to preſerve the rights of lawful Government, and the exiſtence of civilized ſociety, without the entire overthrow of the ſyſtem of anarchy, which has done ſo much miſchief, of the Republic by which it is upholden, and of the Revolution by which it was produced.

But ſuppoſing that the French Republic were not that wild, unruly, and miſchievous thing, which it is here repreſented to be, how is it poſſible to think of negociating with France, while in ſo unſettled and precarious a ſtate? To entertain ſuch an idea, is to ſet at defiance, not only every dictate of common ſenſe, but alſo every principle, which has hitherto been conſidered as indiſpenſable in the formation of treaties. It has ever been admitted as a fundamental rule, eſtabliſhed not merely by convenience or conſent, but founded in reaſon and neceſſity, and capable of no exception, that treaties can only be made by that Sovereign power, which conſtitutes the Government of a country: and as they are in their nature mutual, and meant to be binding on both parties, there muſt exiſt, on each ſide, the eſſential requiſites to render them valid, and to give them effect. An authority, which has been recognized (though not very fairly) by Mr. Fox, in

in a partial quotation, is perfectly explicit on this ſubject.

" PUBLIC treaties can only be executed by " ſuperior powers, by *Sovereigns* who contract " in the name of the State." " The Sovereign " who poſſeſſes the *full* and *abſolute* authority, " has, doubtleſs, a right to treat in the name of " the State he repreſents—his engagements are " binding with reſpect to the whole nation."

VATTEL. B. xi. C. 12.

THE poſſeſſion of the *ſovereign power* is, therefore, neceſſary to give competence to the contracting party—But can the momentary and precarious poſſeſſion of *vague and undefined authority*, be ſufficient for the purpoſe? The ſame author has obviated all difficulty on this point, by giving a clear and preciſe rule, by which to judge of the competence of a power to enter into treaties.

" IN the fundamental laws of each State, we " muſt ſee what is the power capable of con- " tract with validity in the name of the State."

*Ibid.*

IT is therefore the poſſeſſion of the *Sovereignty*, aſcertained and deſignated by eſtabliſhed and *fundamental laws*, which can alone

 give

give competence to contract in the name of a State. It is not, indeed, a matter of inquiry, by what right or title that poſſeſſion was acquired; ſuch an inquiry would imply, in the party making it, a juriſdiction incompatible with the independence of the other party. But nothing can diſpenſe with the exiſtence and exerciſe of thoſe powers, which, according to *fundamental laws*, conſtitute the Sovereignty of a State, and which can alone confer the character of regular and ſettled Government. Short of this what can render a treaty efficacious and obligatory, or afford any rational proſpect of its being obſerved? An uſurper, in full poſſeſſion of the Sovereign Power, defined as above, is competent, by virtue of his poſſeſſion, to make a treaty, and to bind, not only the State, but even the rightful Prince himſelf, ſhould he ever reſume his authority. For a treaty is made on behalf of the State, which it obliges, and derives its efficacy from the Power, by which it is made, rather than the individual poſſeſſing that Power; and, as it has been already obſerved, the particular claim of that individual is not cognizable by the other party. Therefore, whether it be a Tudor, or a Plantagenet, a *red or a white Roſe*, the acts of the *poſſeſſor* are valid, both for the purpoſes of internal legiſlation, and of foreign treaty. Nay, if the Duke of Orleans, miſcreant as he was, had ſucceeded in his execrable purpoſe, and, inſtead

of

of receiving his juſt reward, in being ſacrificed by thoſe whom he had excited to rebellion, had waded through the blood of his Sovereign to the Crown of France,—the defect of his title, and the guilt of his uſurpation, (although they would have juſtified the exertions of loyalty in favour of the rightful prince,) would have created no incapacity in him for the performance of public acts. Thus the Sovereign *de facto* is fully competent to all purpoſes of Sovereignty. But, from the neceſſity of the caſe, that Sovereignty muſt exiſt ſomewhere, in clear and viſible poſſeſſion, otherwiſe there is nobody with whom to contract. There muſt be a ſupreme power, eſtabliſhed in conformity to "*fundamental laws*," that is to ſay, there muſt ſubſiſt an eſtabliſhed, Government, or there can be no Power "capable "of contract with validity in the name of the "State."

Of all treaties, *that* which requires moſt care and circumſpection, in reſpect of its being made by a power competent to contract, and able to give effect to engagements, is a Treaty of Peace. For, upon ſuch a treaty, we quit not only that condition of armed force, by which we ſought to attain the object of the War, but even that poſture of defence, on which, perhaps, our ſecurity depended, and which it may be very difficult to reſume; and we rely, not on our

own vigour or vigilance, but on the good faith of the party with whom we contract, and on his ability, as well as his honour, to enforce his ſtipulations. It is, therefore, of the utmoſt importance to take care, that all the circumſtances, requiſite to give effect to treaties in general, ſhould exiſt, in the cleareſt manner, upon the occaſion of *ſuch* a treaty; and common policy demands that we ſhould not only be cautious, but even ſcrupulous and faſtidious in that reſpect. Otherwiſe we might, and probably ſhould, in a ſhort time, have reaſon to repent our miſplaced confidence, and find ourſelves again in a ſtate of war, but with infinitely greater diſadvantage, than when we ſuffered our blind impatience for repoſe to induce us, raſhly and unadviſedly, to quit *that* State. The authority already quoted recognizes the ſuperior importance of Treaties of Peace, and thereby ſuggeſts the neceſſity of particular caution in the concluſion of ſuch treaties.

" THE treaty of Peace concluded by a *lawful* " *power*, is undoubtedly a public treaty, obli- " gatory on the whole nation.—Theſe treaties " (of peace) concern and bind whole nations, " *they are of the utmoſt importance; the breach of* " *them certainly rekindles the war:* reaſons which " add a new force to the obligation of keeping " our faith, and punctually fulfilling our pro- " miſes."—VATTEL, B. iv. C. 4. Sec. 35, 36.

It is, therefore, upon the whole, eſſential to the ſubſtance and validity of treaties, and of peculiar importace in treaties of peace, that they be negociated only with a power, competent to pledge the faith of the nation, which they are meant to bind, and capable of enforcing the fulfilment of its promiſes: a power in full poſſeſſion, —not of a momentary and precarious aſcendancy, —not of a vague authority, as indefinite in its rights, as irregular in its acquiſition and exerciſe,—but of the REAL SOVEREIGNTY, recognized by eſtabliſhed uſage, and aſcertained by fixed and *fundamental laws*.

Now, what is the condition of France, with which country we are inceſſantly urged to negociate for peace. Is there any power in that country, exiſting in conformity to *fundamental laws*; any which can be denominated, a ſettled and eſtabliſhed Government? Is it not rather the groſſeſt mockery to apply the term Government to any authority, now exerciſed in that diſtracted nation. The Government, which for centuries directed the affairs of France, and which *was* eſtabliſhed on *fundamental laws*, has been intirely overthrown; not a veſtige of it remains, except in the hearts of the people, who would be almoſt mad with joy to ſee it reſtored.—What has ſucceeded to that Government but mutability, confuſion, and uproar? Who will ſay that another Government

has been ſubſtituted in its place, or that there is a poſſibility of ſubſtituting another Government, with the ſmalleſt probability of its being permanent? Who will ſay that there is a power in France, capable "of contract with validity in the "name of the State*?" Who will ſay that any engagements which can be made with that country to day, will be in force to-morrow—that they will oblige the State—that they will bind the party, which ſhall next attain the power, ſuch as it is—or even be adhered to by the party, by which they may be tranſacted, during the continuance of its frail dominion? Or will any one aſſert that ſtipulations, ſo made, will be obligatory upon the lawful Government, ſhould it reſume its rights? The Revolution has been, not like other Revolutions, a mere change of perſons, but a ſubver-

* Thoſe Governments which are diſpoſed to negociate with the French Republic, may be aſſiſted in forming a juſt idea of the value of treaties formed with ſuch a power, by adverting to the report of Briſſot in the Convention on the 20th Nov. 1792, reſpecting the affairs of Genoa. "Doubtleſs," ſaid this *ſage* legiſlator, "We ſhall examine whether a free people can and ought to bind itſelf by treaties: whether they be not *uſeleſs* with Republics, which the ſame common principles ought to unite, and *indecent* with every Government which does not hold its power of the people; for, perhaps, that is the ſecret of your Revolution, and of thoſe which are *preparing*." Nor ſhould it be forgotten, that at a more recent period Tallien has acknowledged that "the prin-"ciples of the Republic with regard to foreign States are "not yet fixed."

ſion

ſion of all lawful power,—of all regular authority. Leaving out of the queſtion the atrocious means, by which the men, with whom alone it is now poſſible to treat, have advanced themſelves to their preſent ſituation—forgetting, for a moment, if it be poſſible ſo far to control the memory, the pernicious principles they profeſs, the deteſtable practices they purſue, and the deſtructive projects they avow—is their power ſuch as regular Governments can recognize by negociation, upon any grounds of ſecurity, conſiſtency, or even of decency? What are they but the leaders of the anarchy, which they have produced, and which they prolong? Powers, indeed, they have, but only to do evil—they have power to deſtroy, but not to reſtore—they have pulled down, but they cannot rebuild—good is as much out of their power, as it is foreign from their inclination. A treaty made with ſuch men might have forms, but where would be its ſubſtance? Nay, they do not even pretend to the Sovereignty, for they profeſs, however their conduct may be at variance with their profeſſions, that this attribute, which can alone give a right to treat in the name of the State *, reſides wholly and ſolely in the people, and is the unalienable right of that capricious and indefinite body. This is the only *fundamental law* of their ſyſtem—the ſole, acknowledged baſis of their

* See Vattel *ſupra*.

authority: a baſis, which, like a quickſand, not only fails to ſupport, but ſwallows up whatever is attempted to be erected upon it. Therefore, according to their own ſhowing, they are not competent to contract—and in order to make a valid treaty, we muſt negociate with the ſovereign people; at leaſt, our treaty muſt be ratified by King Mob, or it will be as deficient in form as in ſubſtance.

But, waving ſuch objections, is there, for the fleeting moment, even a decided and excluſive poſſeſſion of the power, ſuch as it is, which though unable to govern France, ſerves to oppreſs and ruin it. What man or ſet of men can be ſaid to have ſuch poſſeſſion. Is it Tallien or Cambaceres, or Sieyes, or Dumont, or Thibaudaut, or Boiſſy d'Anglas? Which of the contending factions can be ſaid to hold thoſe reins, at which every faction is ſnatching? Which of the numerous branches, into which the pretended *moderates* are divided, can be ſaid to poſſeſs a complete and laſting ſuperiority? The *poor* Jacobins, indeed, ſeem to be got under—but, like the giants of ancient fable, they ſhake the mountains that cover them; and though they be not able to riſe, they may ſtill convulſe the earth.—But whether the Girondiſts, the Federaliſts, or the Partiſans of a Republic, *one and indiviſible*, ſhall prevail, who will pretend to decide? Since the

the fall of Robeſpierre, no ſucceſſor has been able to eſtabliſh himſelf on the throne of that tyrant. All is diſorder, contention, and diſcord, and the ſucceſs of a party is but the ſignal of new diviſions. As to the Convention, which is held out to us as a ſolid and permanent body, that aſſembly has been made ſubſervient to all parties, and is ſure to be in the hands of any party, which can acquire a momentary aſcendancy—ready to hail its triumphs, to applaud its meaſures, and to effectuate its deſigns;—or it may be conſidered as the grand theatre, where theſe gladiators contend for victory, and where, in lieu of thoſe who are carried off the ſtage, freſh combatants preſent themſelves, in quick ſucceſſion, to diſpute, with equal obſtinacy, the anarchical palm.

WITHOUT relying, however, upon our own obſervations, let us hear what theſe men, themſelves, ſay upon the ſubject. They do not even pretend that there is a government in France, or that there exiſt, in that country, any powers but what are *proviſional and revolutionary*. This is the whole tenour of their diſcourſes—the ſum total of their jargon, reſpecting the interior ſituation of the country. A few extracts may be of uſe to remind the reader of this truth, although, for any other purpoſe, they would be an inſult on his underſtanding and his feelings.

On the 18th April, or, according to republican computation, the 19th of *Germinal*, Chazal ſaid, in the Convention, "We muſt prepare to give "the people a government." Indeed, it muſt be allowed to be high time. But how is this to be done? "Aye, there's the rub."—The orator is not very confident on this point, for he proceeds, "make "a trial." To be ſure, trials enough have not been made.—But who will promiſe that this ſhall be the laſt? He muſt be blind indeed, who does not ſee that the only trial, which has a chance for ſucceſs, is *that* which has been found to anſwer for ſo many centuries. However, this incurable ſpeculatiſt propoſes the choice "of twenty-four members of the Convention to "govern,"—that is "to unite, by collecting, "all the factions of power," and theſe deputies, ſo appointed, are to have "the power of execu-"tion placed in their hands, as Conſuls of the "French Republic," and to produce "the ad-"vantage of a well concentrated Government."

This propoſal, was referred to the committees upon the motion of Boiſſy d'Anglas, who obſerved, with great truth, that "the preſent "government had not *ſtrength enough*," and that "the *fear of giving too much power*, "*often prevented perſons from governing well.*"

In the ſitting of the next day, Pelet, in a long ſpeech, gave the following ſketch of the ſtate of

of France:—" For theſe five years paſt, the " people, who deſired to be happy, have been " *duped with words:* for five years paſt they " *have been oppreſſed and have ſeverely ſmarted.*" (Could any thing be more true?) " Let us " no longer adjourn our duty and their rights, " for ambition and crime, ignorance and fa- " mine, will not ceaſe to ſpread their devaſta- " tions. The erroneous ſyſtem of our political " economy is the ſource of all our ſufferings. " The ſcarcity of proviſions cauſes objections to " be made againſt the form of our Government; " its principles ought, therefore, to be reviſed " and renewed. Our manufactures languiſh, " and our maritime trade is deſtroyed; the " military is our main object, the armies are " the only conſumers. Whilſt our victories " render us illuſtrious, and conſolidate our power " abroad, diſorder ſhakes the very foundation " of ſociety in the interior. Whilſt, by our " energy, we triumph abroad, and the coa- " leſced kings are forced to ſue for peace, weak- " neſs and want of energy have crept into the " interior. What cauſes the true friend of his " country to be alarmed for the fate of France? " His fears ariſe from his conviction, that as " long as we have no *certain ſettled Govern-* " *ment*, all our meaſures cannot poſſibly extir- " pate *that anarchy, which is inſeparable from* " *a proviſional ſtate of things*, and from laws

" dictated

" dictated by circumſtances, which ultimately " muſt plunge us into all the horrors of a civil " war. Does the Conſtitution of 1793 contain " any principle, powerful enough to guarantee " to the French people the duration of their " Republican exiſtence? Where is this prin- " ciple? Where is that protecting inſtitution, " which ſhelters it from the innovation of thoſe " legiſlators, who are to ſuperſede the Conven- " tion? One ſays, that *legs muſt be given* to " this Conſtitution, without which it would be " impoſſible to put it in motion. Others talk " of the addition of *organical laws*, in order " to give it motion and life. The 34th article " ſays, that at the requeſt of one fifth part of " the citizens, extraordinary primary aſſemblies " ſhall be convened. But *have not frequent* " *examples convinced us all, how eaſy it is for* " *intrigues to collect groupes of reſtleſs and tur-* " *bulent people?*"

PELET, after having ſhown the impropriety of ſeveral other articles, in the Conſtitution of 1793, proceeded to call to recollection, by what men, under what circumſtances, with what views, and with what haſte, that Conſtitution had been propoſed, framed, and adopted. He proved that " its authors had no other aim, than, by means " of this Conſtitution, *to perpetuate their power.*" He ſaw in it every where " *the ſeeds of oppreſſion,* " *uſurpation, danger, and alarms;*" and from thence

thence he deduced the concluſion, that " it ought to be reviſed and corrected."

THESE are tolerably candid confeſſions reſpecting the ſtate of France, and prove, not only that it is deſtitute of a *ſettled* Government, but that even the all ſufficient confidence of French Legiſlators is, at length, baffled, and finds itſelf at a loſs how to eſtabliſh one; and that the conſtitution, which was *laſt* framed, and which was kept in *petto*, for future uſe, was found to be *lame*, inefficient and inapplicable, while the proviſional and revolutionary ſtate of things was productive of *weakneſs* and *anarchy*, and tended to all the horrors of Civil War. The remedy propoſed by Pelet was the convening of the primary aſſemblies. And, as it coſts the Convention nothing to reſolve and re-reſolve, the propoſal was adopted. It ſhould, however, be remembered that juſt at this criſis the Jacobins, ſtill formidable, were expected to make a violent effort in favour of ſome Deputies of that party, whom the moderates wanted to get rid of; and as the nature of Jacobin efforts was pretty well underſtood, the ruling party *pro tempore*, ſomewhat doubtful of the reſult, thought, perhaps, that the Primary Aſſemblies might, in caſe of emergency, afford them an opportunity of gliding off the ſtage, or, at leaſt, of extricating themſelves in ſome way or other from

from the difficulty. But as, by the aid of Pichegru, the conteſt terminated in their favour, and the Jacobins were completely defeated, the Primary Aſſemblies were no longer wanted, and we ſoon find it decreed in conventional phraſe, that *there was no room to deliberate about their convocation.**

WERE it neceſſary to accumulate evidence, to prove a propoſition ſo obvious to all the world, and ſo fully recognized by the Convention itſelf, as this, that France is deſtitute of a Government, it might not be amiſs to introduce Cambaceres, preſenting, on the 18th of April, a report from a Committee of ſeven, who had been charged to preſent a plan for preparing *the organic laws*, and for putting the conſtitutional act, partially and ſucceſſively, into a ſtate of activity; on which occaſion it was decreed, that a committee of eleven members ſhould be formed, to prepare the *organic laws*. By which it appears, that theſe Siſy-

* Briſſot gives an idea of the nature of *primary aſſemblies*, convened by authority of the Republic in *foreign* countries, for the purpoſe of putting the people in poſſeſſion of the ineſtimable and unalienable right of chooſing their own Government. Speaking of the Belgians, he ſays, "Who at this time is unacquainted with the ſprings of this "miſerable puppet ſhew? Who does not know the *primary* "*aſſemblies*, compoſed of a preſident, of a ſecretary, and a "few aſſiſtants, whoſe day's work was paid for?"

phean

phean legiſlators, after all their labours, are once more at the bottom of the mountain, preparing to roll up their conſtitutional ſtone, which, doubtleſs, 'ere it approaches the ſummit, will again revolve back, and leave the important, but endleſs, taſk to be recommenced *de novo*.

On the 26th of April, Thibaudeau is found thus addreſſing the Convention—"To heal the "wounds which tyranny had inflicted on France, "the only way was to give her a government— "You have thirteen Committees, or in other "words thirteen governments, which can neither "underſtand, nor act in concert with each other, "and which check, inſtead of accelerating, the "progreſs of affairs. You cannot, without injury "to the public cauſe, ſuffer that relaxation in the "execution of the laws, which manifeſts itſelf "under your very eyes. *Every body would com-* "*mand and nobody would obey*.—I propoſe the "following decree." The firſt article of this decree was to confide the government to the Committee of Public Safety, until the organic laws of the conſtitution of 1793 ſhould be adopted. The propoſition was referred to the Committees. Two days afterwards, on the ſubject of confiſcations, Delmas ſuggeſted the propriety of poſtponing the diſcuſſion till the queſtion on the *particular form of government* ſhould be decided. April 29th, the Section of Butte des Moulins

Moulins ſuggeſted, "the neceſſity of ſtrengthening the government, and of preventing the "diſaſters of anarchy." The Section requeſted, "the adoption of a firm and energetic government." The Preſident replied, that "the "right of petition was ſacred, and that the citizens poſſeſſed the undoubted right of offering "their obſervations upon the *beſt form of government!*"

FERMONT,—"The people are almoſt in as "much want of a *government* as of *proviſions.*"

BUT the reader is, doubtleſs, long ſince tired of ſuch company, which can ſerve only to raiſe in his mind emotions of diſguſt and horror. Such, however, are the hands which are to ratify the Pacification, into which we are adviſed to enter. Such is the ſtate of a country, even according to the repreſentation of thoſe who are at the head of its affairs, with which it is propoſed to form relations of peace, amity, and concord.

BUT, in ſupport of the plan of preſent negociation, it is taken for granted, that peace would be the means of eſtabliſhing regular Government in France. What can poſſibly give riſe to ſuch a ſuppoſition, but that confuſion of ideas,

ideas, which admits of no diſtinct view, either of the ultimate object, or of the means of its attainment, and which at the ſame time conceals from notice the abſurdity it involves? To repreſent pacification as the means of eſtabliſhing regular government, inſtead of conſidering ſuch eſtabliſhment as the indiſpenſable preliminary of peace, is an inverſion of cauſe and effect, not to be equalled in the annals of ſophiſtry. In familiar and homely phraſe, it is placing the cart before the horſe; or, to reſort to a more original alluſion, it is about as abſurd as it would be to turn a vane, in order to change the direction of the wind. What produced the war, but the ſubverſion of regular Government in France? And now, forſooth, we are to truſt to the anarchy, which unavoidably reſulted from that ſubverſion, for a reſtoration of the bleſſings of Peace, and for the return of ſettled Government, without which, it is clear, that Peace cannot ſubſiſt. We are to unchain the monſter, in full confidence that he will change his nature, that he will lay aſide his fury, and become mild and gentle—humble and ſelf denying—and that, when convinced that war cannot ſubdue him, he will ſubdue himſelf, and lay his trophies at the feet of regular government and legitimate authority! *Riſum teneatis!*

Oh! but ſay the advocates for immediate pacification, a great and wonderful change has taken place in France—the people are become weary of anarchy, and pant for peace, order, and repoſe—their diſpoſitions ſeem to be even favourable to Royalty—gentleneſs and moderation have, in a great degree, aſſumed the place of that ferocious and ſanguinary ſpirit, which, till lately, characterized the Revolution—the rulers of the French nation, inſtead of ſeeking to propagate their principles to the remoteſt corners of the globe, are diſpoſed to recognize and to negociate with thoſe Sovereigns, who, a little while ſince, were branded as tyrants, and maked out to be ſacrificed at the ſhrine of univerſal freedom—nay, it is even ſuggeſted, that the Convention, thus metamorphoſed, might poſſibly conſent to negociate with this country, with that Britiſh *Carthage*, which, a few months ago, was menaced with utter extermination. But can there exiſt a ſtronger inducement than is contained in theſe ſtatements, to puſh the war with the utmoſt vigour? Theſe wonderful changes, ſuppoſing them to be real, have all taken place *during the War*, and they, ſurely, afford the greateſt encouragement to purſue it with increaſed alacrity! Shall we relinquiſh a ſyſtem, under which ſuch favourable, ſuch flattering ſymptoms, begin to appear?—Shall we leave the malady to itſelf, free to reſume its former violence, when there is ſuch a proſpect of its

its being exterminated?—Shall we quit the conflagration when its fury begins to abate—when it affords ſuch reaſon to hope that it may be intirely extinguiſhed.

The extreme and unutterable miſery to which the war, conducted in ſo deſperate a manner, on the part of France, has reduced that country, tends naturally to bring it to its ſenſes; and the ſyſtem of comparative moderation, which its preſent rulers have been obliged to adopt, for the purpoſes of the moment, and which, in the preſent ſtate of embarraſſment, they cannot eaſily abandon, affords an opportunity for a diſplay of the effects, which have been produced by diſtreſs on the minds of the people. The wretchedneſs of their ſituation has not only abated their zeal for proſelytiſm, and diminiſhed that ſympathetic ardour for the liberties of mankind, by which the earlier ſtages of the Revolution were diſtinguiſhed, but it has alſo weakened their attachment to thoſe principles, which were the objects of their enthuſiaſm, and which they ſought to render univerſal. They find that the pinchings of hunger are not a very powerful recommendation of the new ſyſtem of liberty and equality—that the Rights of Man afford but very unſubſtantial fare—that their ideal ſovereignty, beſides that it ſubjects them to the worſt of tyranny, is but an indifferent ſubſtitute for bread, and that an Anar-

chical Republic is, upon the whole, a miſerable exchange for an ancient Crown, the ſplendour of which depended on a flouriſhing commerce, a ſucceſsful agriculture, the advancement of arts and manufactures, and the welfare and proſperity of the State. The general war, provoked by that ſyſtem of univerſal moleſtation, which was one of the diſtinguiſhing features of the Revolution, has but accelerated the natural internal effects of ſuch a Revolution, and brought its fruits to an early maturity: and, with a juſtice which marks the finger of Providence, the deſperate and unprecedented efforts, made for the ſubverſion of all ſocial order in other States, have redounded to the ruin of the State, whence they proceeded. It was for the benefit of mankind, that the connection between vice and miſery was eſtabliſhed. Never was that connection ſo ſtrikingly exemplified as in France;—where the violation of every ſanction of morality and religion—where the diſſolution of every ſocial tie—where perfidy, cruelty, and injuſtice—where rebellion, regicide, and impiety,—have been ſpeedily followed by oppreſſion, famine and deſolation—by an accumulation, in ſhort, of all the calamities which can befal a nation—while the proſpect of the future ſerves only to heighten the preſent ſufferings.*

So

* Whoever is deſirous of taking a view of the internal ſituation of France, during a conſiderable part of the Revolution, will be both entertained and inſtructed by peruſing a work

So ſevere a chaſtiſement was never before inflicted, and never before deſerved. But the leſſon is not yet complete. It has produced regrets,

work intitled, "A Reſidence in France during the years "1792, 1793, 1794, and 1795, deſcribed in a Series of "Letters from an Engliſh Lady." In this work, (which, though written under the greateſt diſadvantages, would have done honour to *any* pen), the diſtreſſes produced by a ſcarcity of bread are thus deſcribed, in a letter dated Amiens, May 9, 1795: "Whilſt all Europe is probably watching with ſolicitude the progreſs of the French arms, the French themſelves, almoſt indifferent to war and politics, think only of averting the horrors of famine. The important news of the day is the portion of bread which is to be diſtributed; and the ſiege of Mentz, or the treaty with the King of Pruſſia, are almoſt forgotten, amidſt enquiries about the arrival of corn, and anxiety for the approach of harveſt. The ſame paper that announces the ſurrender of towns, and the ſucceſs of battles, tells us that the poor die in the ſtreets of Paris, or are driven to commit ſuicide through want. Detachments of the National Guards, reinforced by cannon, often ſearch the adjacent villages ſeveral days ſucceſſively, without finding a ſingle *ſeptier* of corn. The poor, who have neither plate nor money, exchange their beſt clothes or linen for a loaf, or a ſmall quantity of flour. Our gates are ſometimes aſſailed by twenty or thirty people, not to beg money, but bread, and I am frequently accoſted in the ſtreets by women of decent appearance, who, when I offer them aſſignats, refuſe them, ſaying, we have enough of this ſorry paper—it is bread we want. If you are aſked to dine, you take your bread with you, and you travel as though you were going a voyage—for there are not many inns on the road, where you can expect to find bread, or, indeed, proviſions of any kind."—Vol. 2. p. 393. 2d Edition. From this condition of diſtreſs France was reſcued by neutral States,

rets, but it has not yet wrought a reformation. The war affords the only ſecurity for the benefit of the example, either in reſpect of France, or of mankind. It is only by the war, and the ſufferings, which muſt attend its continuance, that the monſter of anarchy can be completely ſubdued.—Relieved from that preſſure, and ſuffered to go, once more, at large, he would ſpeedily become as outrageous as ever. It would be madneſs to quit him until, by the reſtoration of order and government, a force be eſtabliſhed, which ſhall be fully competent to hold him in ſubjection, and to prevent him from again ruſhing forth, to the utter deſtruction of civil ſociety. He exhibits, indeed, ſome ſymptoms of comparative gentleneſs and moderation, or rather he appears with mitigated ferocity.—But what would not that credulity deſerve, which ſhould place any confidence in ſuch appearances.—His nature is unchanged and unchangeable, and he is more truly dangerous under the ſpecious garb of moderation, than in the wildeſt exceſſes of fury. It is ſtill the wolf, though in ſheep's clothing, endeavouring to deceive in order the more effectually to deſtroy.

THE internal ſituation of France—the exhauſted ſtate of its reſources—the intire de-

and particularly by America, to whom ſhe has ſince teſtified her gratitude in a very remarkable manner!—*Note to the Collection.*

ſtruction

ſtruction of its finances — the increaſing ſcarcity which it hourly experiences, and which is already ſo great as to reduce even the inhabitants of the capital to a ſlender ratio, the rapid approach of complete famine, and the cheerleſs proſpect of a ſcanty harveſt—ſuch are the circumſtances which, by rendering peace not only the univerſal wiſh, but indiſpenſable to the continuance of the preſent ſyſtem, have compelled the oppreſſors of France to abate much of their ferocity towards the people, and of their inſolence towards Foreign Powers *; and have given to the Revolution an air of gentleneſs, which appears altogether forced and unnatural. The ſucceſſors of the nephew of D'Amiens are thus obliged to ſupport that character of moderation, which they

* It is worth while to obſerve the change which has taken place, in a ſhort time, in the language of theſe demagogues, reſpecting the Sovereigns of Europe. Among the innumerable examples that might be cited to point out the ſtriking contraſt between their former and their recent ſtyle, the following may ſuffice as a ſpecimen.

In 1793 Publicola Chauſſard, one of the Commiſſioners of the Convention in the Netherlands, ſaid, "this is a war *ad* "*internecionem* between the Republic and Monarchies." And in 1794 the ſame ſentiment was expreſſed by the Preſident, ſpeaking *ex Cathedra* in the Convention—"This is a war to "laſt till death between Republicans and Kings." On the 9th of April, 1795, Pelet, in the before-mentioned report, ſaid, "How glorious is it, with laurels round our heads, to hold "forth the olive branch of peace. It is true, that we our-"ſelves ſhould circumſcribe our conqueſts."

aſſumed for momentary purpoſes, unfavourable as it may be to the vigour and energy, which the exigency of their ſituation requires *. They tremble every inſtant, leſt the irreſiſtible impulſe of hunger ſhould call forth againſt them the popular vengeance, and they ſeek to appeaſe the fury of the famiſhed multitude, by flattering them with hopes of ſpeedy peace. They claim much credit for the peace, which, the infatuation of the King of Pruſſia, has induced that Monarch to conclude with the Republic, and they actually derive ſtrength and conſequence from this peace, which they take care to repreſent as the prelude to other events of the like nature.

They hold forth the idea of returning peace as

* Notwithſtanding this neceſſity, to continue the farce of moderation, there are evident and undeniable ſymptoms of a diſpoſition to return, as ſoon as circumſtances will permit, to that ſyſtem of terror, which *is the natural ſtate of the revolution*, and which would be the immediate effect of that general peace, into which they ſeek to delude the continental powers. Theſe ſymptoms have lately increaſed, and they were very ſtrongly indicated in the Conventional Sitting of the 30th of April, 1795, when it was unanimouſly decreed to put every emigrant upon his trial—and when it appeared, from the general tenor of the diſcuſſion, that it was found indiſpenſably neceſſary, by means of rigour and ſeverity, to repel the alarming progreſs of that public diſpoſition in favour of royalty, which the laxity of the moderate ſyſtem had encouraged to diſplay itſelf.

involving

involving that of returning plenty *. Can farther proofs be wanting, that they conſider pacification as neceſſary to themſelves and their ſyſtem? What elſe could render it their earneſt wiſh, their ſtrenuous purſuit, their avowed object? But, beſides that it is a maxim of obvious policy not to comply with the wiſhes of an adverſary, what is the peace they wiſh to obtain? Can it be believed that it is tranquillity, order, harmony, and repoſe, which they have in view? Are ſuch bleſſings in their contemplation, or compatible with their principles, or even with their exiſtence? They conſider peace, and they rightly conſider it, as neceſſary to extricate them from their preſent difficulties, and to diſſolve a confederacy, which threatens to cruſh them by its united ſtrength. They ſeek it not with any view to its future exiſtence, but ſolely for the ſake of its preſent effect, and that it may enable them the better to purſue their atrocious projects. It is not the fair combatant, who, though the original aggreſſor, is deſirous of terminating the conteſt in an honourable manner, but the murderous aſſaſſin, who, having failed in his purpoſe, ſeeks only to eſcape the blow which

* "The certainty of an approaching peace—yes, of an "approaching peace—this is telling you enough—will change "the order of things, and the citizens ſhall at length enjoy "proſperity and plenty,". Speech of Roux on the 8th of April, 1795, in the name of the Committee of Public Welfare.

threatens

threatens him with immediate deſtruction, determined to ſeize the firſt opportunity of renewing his horrid attempt.

THE powers at war with France have to chooſe between a nominal and a real, a fictitious and a ſubſtantial peace. It is impoſſible that any peace made with France, in its preſent ſtate, ſhould, at the beſt, be more than a ſhort reſpite, a momentary armiſtice, a perfidious truce, a deluſive repoſe from the fatigues of war. But it would be a prelude to Calamities infinitely worſe than War, with all its horrors. It would afford a breathing time to anarchy; but it would prove the palſy of regular government, and deprive it of all power to make another effort. It would be the triumph of the Revolution, and of the friends of revolutions throughout the world *. It would give currency

* The republican rulers already repreſent their treaties of peace as triumphs, which they aſcribe to their principles of moderation and juſtice. Thoſe treaties are indeed triumphs, but owing, not to their moderation and juſtice, but to their hypocriſy and diſſimulation. There is great danger that they may enjoy more of ſuch triumphs, for there ſeems to be a general diſpoſition to truſt to their profeſſions, and to be duped by their pretenſions to virtue and humanity. Thus the miſchief which could never have been accompliſhed during the deteſtable, though undiſſembling reign of terror, may be achieved under the maſk of moderation; and, notwithſtanding the relief which every mind, fraught with ſenſibility, muſt derive from the reflection that torrents of human

rency to French principles, which would ſpeedily inundate every country, notwithſtanding all the dykes that might be raiſed to oppoſe their progreſs; and it would open numberleſs ſluices of ſpeculation and innovation, to ſwell the deſtructive flood. It would infuſe new force into the miſchievous republic, which, being recognized after ſuch a ſtruggle by the whole world, would become, not merely the inſolent arbiter of other States, but the *emporium* of their ſpoils. The invariable effect, produced by ſucceſs on the human mind, would operate greatly in favour of the new ſyſtem; and republican phrenzy, exulting in its ſucceſs, would find in every remaining want but a motive of revenge, and a ſtimulus to further aggreſſion and hoſtility. The very ſprings of internal contention would be rendered more elaſtic by ſuch a peace, which would, therefore, conduce ſtill more to the ſyſtem of external moleſtation; and while faction would be conſtantly engaged with faction, that domeſtic ſtrife, which is inſeparable from anarchy, would be prevented from burſting forth into the deciſive proceſs of civil war, by the animating project of foreign aggrandiſement; the only poſſible balance of contentious powers in an anarchical ſtate.

human blood no longer flow, as in the time of Robeſpierre, there is reaſon to fear, that the overthrow of that atrocious monſter may eventually prove a ſevere misfortune to humanity.

*" Nec vitam ſine Marte grati, quippe omnis in armis*
*Lucis cauſa ſita eſt, et damatum vivere pace."*

The queſtion of peace with the French Republic may be reduced to a plain and ſimple dilemma. Such a peace muſt be concluded under the idea, either that *that* Republic will be able to eſtabliſh itſelf, or that it will not. In the firſt caſe, what will be the conſequence of the eſtabliſhment of ſuch a Republic; what its probable and natural effect on the ſyſtem of Europe? In the ſecond, what is to become of the treaty of peace when the Republic, with which it is made, ſhall ceaſe to exiſt? What ſort of a peace is that which is founded on the ſuppoſition, that the power with which it is concluded cannot maintain itſelf? Again, what ſecurity would there be againſt the contracting party itſelf, in the firſt inſtance? What would be the value of its guarantee, in the ſecond?

It is true that the attention of the Republic to its engagements with neutral States, is ſometimes relied on as a proof, that it is capable of maintaining relations of concord and amity with regular government, and that it may be truſted for the performance of its ſtipulations by treaty. But it is forgotten by thoſe who advance this argument, that the Republic is now in a ſtate of war, and of conſequent dependence on neutral nations for the very means, not only of

proſecuting that war, but of procuring internal ſubſiſtence. It would, therefore, be ſtrange, if it did not conſtrain itſelf to perform its own part of thoſe engagements, from which alone it can derive ſuch neceſſary ſupplies. But on the ſuppoſition of a general peace, the neceſſity which now impels it to this appearance of juſtice and punctuality would ceaſe; and as it is impoſſible to ſay that there exiſts any principle to ſupply the place of that neceſſity, it would follow no other rule than what its own caprice, ambition, or projects of aggreſſion and ſubverſion might ſuggeſt: and the States, to which it is ſo much indebted for their neutrality, would be the firſt to experience its violence and injuſtice *.

How then, would the States, which have been obliged to take up arms, in order to preſerve themſelves from Gallic incurſions and depredations, lament the raſh and haſty termination of the war! How would they regret the opportunity, which they had thrown away, of extirpating an enemy, of whoſe diſpoſition and ability to injure them they had had ſuch unequivocal proofs! How would they curſe their folly in liſtening to his inſidious overtures of peace, inſtead of being encouraged thereby to make a vigorous and deciſive effort to cruſh him intirely! How would they, in ſhort, bewail the loſs of the powerful

* How completely has this prediction been verified, even before a general Peace!

means

means of defence and ſecurity, afforded them by the war, and wiſh that ſuch means were, once more, within their reach! But, alas! it would be then—too late; the Confederacy, formed for the preſervation of the ſocial union, would be no more; and ſociety, abandoned to its fate, languiſhing under the wounds already received, diſheartened as well as exhauſted by its recent and unfortunate ſtruggle, deſtitute of energy, incapable of co-operation, and attacked, at once, by every exulting foe both within and without—would be totally incapable of withſtanding another ſhock *. Even this ſea-girt Iſle, falſe to itſelf, and treacherous to the cauſe of humanity, would fall an eaſy prey to thoſe moral and deſtructive influences, which it had confirmed and ſanctioned by its own act, and which no advantages of ſituation, no phyſical force, no excellence of conſtitution, nothing, in ſhort, but the moſt determined and inflexible reſiſtance, can counteract.

SHOULD any perſon think the above picture too bold an anticipation of futurity, let him conſider, for a moment, what poſſible ſecurity can be obtained by negociation, for the continuance of peace, for a ſingle hour, when the combined Powers, through a blind confidence in the promiſes of

* This dreadful cataſtrophe has been prevented ſolely by the perſeverance of Great Britain. The warning, thank Heaven, is ſtill in time. May it now have its due effect!—*Note to the Collection.*

the French Republic, ſhall have ſheathed the ſword, diſſolved their alliance, and ſeparated and diſbanded their forces—let him conſider how difficult it would be for thoſe powers again to erect the ſtandard of war—let him anticipate the impediments, which, on the part of regular government, would embarraſs the proſecution of another war, ſuppoſing it poſſible to reſume, once more, a poſture of defence.—If the difficulties attending the preſent conteſt be ſo great, as to ſeem to furniſh a motive for pacification, let him ſay how it will be poſſible to reſiſt the enemy, when all the comparative advantages we now poſſeſs ſhall have been irretrievably ſacrificed, and the ſcale ſhall be turned decidedly againſt us.—Above all, let him reflect on the ſpirit and tendency of the Revolution*, on the principles of the Republic,

* It ſurely behoves the States of Europe, connected as they are by the cloſeſt ties—derived in a great meaſure from the ſame origin—acknowledging in their common concerns the ſame public law—regulated in their internal policy by the ſame general principles, variouſly combined and modified, according to their reſpective circumſtances—aſſociating together in the ſtricteſt intimacy—relieving each other's wants, and contributing to each other's convenience and proſperity, by commercial intercourſe, by communications in learning and ſcience, and by reciprocal exchanges of the productions of their reſpective labour and ingenuity—and finally, depending, both for their individual preſervation and their common ſecurity, on the principles of civil ſubordination, and on the influence of morality and religion; it ſurely behoves

dublic, and on the nature of that diſorganizing ſyſtem, which being once recognized by a treaty of peace, would be eſtabliſhed on a firmer baſis than before, and left free to effect that general ſubverſion, to which it tends as invariably as the needle points to the pole:—let him remember what has been, and thence judge what may again occur—let him recollect how ſudden the tempeſt, which has menaced ſociety with total deſtruction—how great its fury—how dreadful its ravages! What dependence can be placed on the momentary ſunſhine of peace—what certainty can the tranſient gleam afford, that the ſtorm will not preſently return with redoubled fury? What ſecurity can exiſt until the elements of univerſal confuſion and anarchy, inſtead of being merely aſſuaged, be compreſſed within thoſe original bounds by which they had been long reſtrained, and by which alone, (as dreadful experience has proved,) they can be reſtrained, from deſolating the world. It is not by a vain treaty, which would only ſet them free from the checks impoſed on them by the war, and which would be blown to ſhivers upon the ſlighteſt eruption of their fury, that theſe elements can be repreſſed; but only by ſubjecting them to a *force*, capable of controling them effectually, and of preventing

behoves ſuch States to conſider the nature, tendency, and example of that Revolution, which it is propoſed to ſanction, by treaties of peace and amity with its inſtigators, agents, and upholders.

them

them from again burſting forth to the annoyance and deſtruction of mankind.

*Luctantes ventos, tempeſtateſque ſonoras*
Imperio *premit, ac vinclis et carcere frænat.*

——Regemque *dedit, qui fœdere certo,*
*Et premere, et laxas ſciret dare juſſas habenas.*

INSTEAD, therefore, of liſtening to the ſyren ſounds of peace, which treacherouſly invite us to deſtruction, let us purſue the war with increaſing ardour, until it may be exchanged for that ſtate of ſecurity, which is compatible with quiet and repoſe, and without which peace would be but a deceptious and evaneſcent form. Warned by a recollection of the paſt, encouraged by a ſurvey of the preſent, and impelled by a wiſe and prudent ſolicitude for the future, let us truſt to our own vigilance, and exertions, until there be in France a power, capable of maintaining domeſtic order, and compatible with the ſafety and independence of other States. Peace is, undoubtedly, the object of every juſt war; and it is ſo, in an eminent degree, on the preſent occaſion. But it is the peculiar nature of the preſent war to ſuperinduce the remarkable and unprecedented neceſſity of rendering peace practicable—before it can be attainable.—There can be no foundation for peace unleſs the arch of Government be reconſtructed in France, and rendered firm and

 durable;

durable; which it can never be until compreſſed and conſolidated by the key ſtone of its ancient Monarchy. No other key ſtone can be accommodated to this ancient pile, or hold the immenſe maſs together.

THE re-eſtabliſhment of Government in France is, therefore, the indiſpenſable condition of peace; not a condition *ſubſequent*, as the advocates for immediate pacification ſeem to conſider it;—ſuch a ſuppoſition involves the abſurdity of pretending to erect a baſeleſs edifice, leaving the foundation to the laſt;—but a condition *precedent*, which muſt be effectually ſecured before the great work of peace can be begun. This, therefore, muſt be the primary object of the war, or we ſhall never attain that ultimate object, which is the earneſt wiſh of every friend of humanity. This is the point, in which all our plans and operations ſhould concentre, and which ſhould ſuperſede every other conſideration. How to direct the war, with the greateſt promptitude and certainty, to this important end, is the moſt important queſtion that ever engaged the attention of Confederated States —a queſtion, involving the fate not only of the preſent age, but alſo of poſterity. That queſtion has been diſcuſſed in thoſe "Reflections," which, with great deference and reſpect, the Author has once and again preſſed on the attention of the Combined Powers. His preſent object is to warn

warn thoſe Powers againſt the ſtupendous and fatal error of recognizing, by negociation, the natural and irreconcileable enemy of order, tranquillity, and legitimate Government;—to preſerve them from that *ſuicide* which, under the influence of an inconceivable infatuation, ſome of them ſeem inclined to commit;—and to enforce the neceſſity of proſecuting, with the utmoſt vigour, and with inflexible perſeverance, *that* War with anarchy, which has hitherto proved the means of their preſervation, and which is the PALLADIUM of CIVILIZED SOCIETY.

THE END.

9 DE 63